Mediocria:

OR, THE MOST

Natural and Plaineſt Apprehenſions

WHICH

The Scripture offers concerning the

GREAT

DOCTRINES

OF THE

CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

Of **Election**, **Redemption**, **Juſtification**, the **Covenants**, the **Law** and **Goſpel.**

UNIV. EDINBURGEN. 1818

By a lover of all that are ſincere in their hearts, and in their lives, of whatſoever ſort or Sect of Religion.

Qui errare me exiſtimant, etiam atque etiam diligenter quæ ſunt dicta conſiderent, ne ipſi errent. Ego autem cum per eos qui meos labores legant emendatior fio, propitium mihi deum agnoſco: & hoc per Eccleſiæ Doctores expecto, ſi dignentur noſſe quod ſcribo. Auguſtine. *De bono perſeverantiæ*, c. 24.

London, Printed for **T. Parkhurſt**, at the Bible and Three Crowns in *Cheap-ſide*, 1674.

The Epiſtle to the Reader.

Reader,

THeſe three Papers put thus together, (of Election *and* Redemption *formoſt, of* Juſtification *next, and the third of the* Covenants, Law, *and* Goſpel) *make one part of the Work I ſomtimes intended, and that preliminary to two others. I have little encouragement to proceed any further: yet will I not ſay, here ſhall be an End, nor will I preſently reſolve the contrary. I am indeed a perſon in my genius ſomething peculiar, who make no man my Maſter, and no party on my ſide. I find little appetite to Print any notion, though I agree in it with others, unleſs it ariſe firſt out of my own thoughts; and though I could confirm, enlarge, and enrich ſome things in theſe Papers, and others the like (which I have alſo ready) with the auxiliaries of ſeveral late Books, which have grown up ſince mine have ſlept by me, yet does it beſt pleaſe me, when I ſee no need to preſent them otherwiſe, than as they ſprang at firſt from my own Conceptions. For I am perſwaded, that let a man put what flouriſh or colour he can on his Writings, there is a ſenſe and diſcernment in the Judicious and Searching Reader, between an* Original *and* Imitation. *As alſo, that when it happens that any Notion, or Notions do light into the Pens of ſeveral men together, ariſing purely out of their own thoughts, it does bring a ſingular Confirmation to the Truth, as affording ſtrength in the* Agreement, *and a pleaſing profit, in the variety of* Explication. *It is moreover a very little ſelfiſh thing or affection to be Crucified, for any to care which of us it be, that hath it firſt.*

The Epiſtle to the Reader.

The things *I offer, I preſent by way of* Eſſay, *that is as* rough hewen, *and a more accurate compoſure would, I think, but take off from that which is* Native *to them. For the* words, *it is in vain really (I count) for a man who grows into years, and looks after Notion, to vye with the Youthful for Language: neither are Controverſal matters, where the point is more drily to be attended, fit for it. I know this is an age that loves painted faces, and books of ſmooth words; but I ſhall defend my ſelf with that ſaying of* Cicero, *with which alſo I will conclude.* Id maxime quemque decet, quod ſuum cuique eſt maxime. *It is that becomes every man moſt, which is moſt his own; moſt genuine, proper, ready, or natural to him.*

The Authour.

Of

THE
Middle-Way

In One Paper of

ELECTION & REDEMPTION.

With Indifferency between the

ARMINIAN & CALVINIST.

By J. H.

Doing nothing by Partiality, 1 Tim. 5. 21.

LONDON,

Printed for T. Parkhurſt, at the Three
Bibles in *Cheap-ſide*. 1673.

The Epiſtle to the Reader.

The things *I offer, I preſent by way of* Eſſay, *that is as* rough hewen, *and a more accurate compoſure would, I think, but take off from that which is* Native *to them. For the* words, *it is in vain really (I count) for a man who grows into years, and looks after Notion, to vye with the Youthful for Language: neither are Controverſal matters, where the point is more drily to be attended, fit for it. I know this is an age that loves painted faces, and books of ſmooth words; but I ſhall defend my ſelf with that ſaying of* Cicero, *with which alſo I will conclude.* Id maxime quemque decet, quod ſuum cuique eſt maxime. *It is that becomes every man moſt, which is moſt his own; moſt genuine, proper, ready, or natural to him,*

The Authour.

Of

THE
Middle-Way

In One Paper of

ELECTION & REDEMPTION.

With Indifferency between the

ARMINIAN & CALVINIST.

By J. H.

Doing nothing by Partiality, 1 Tim. 5. 21.

LONDON,

Printed for T. Parkhurst, at the Three Bibles in *Cheap-side.* 1673.

OF

Election, or *Predeſtination.*

THe deſigne of theſe Papers is to offer to ſuch as will *conſider*, and can tend to *receive*, or *cultivate* what is offered, ſome Notices of truth which lye upon my mind about ſeverall matters, that, by the *Communication* of the *little* light I have, I may fetch in *more* to my own underſtanding from *others*: and alſo by the *Partiality* that appeares ſo often in the doctrine of the *Orthodox*, I may promote ſome generall kind of condeſcenſion in *all perſons* to a more favourable opinion of one another: the proper conſciouſneſs of our own moſt miſerable palpable blindneſs in moſt things, and ſeveral points of Religion, (wherein many times we are indeed but the more *blind*, becauſe wee think we *ſee*), being enough methinks to make every mortall, even with ſhame and confuſion, to be ready either to have a little *higher* eſtimation of his Brother that differ from him, or a little *leſs* indignation at any ſuch difference, or diſtance in his way and judgment.

I will begin with theſe heads. Of Election, and of Redemption.

It is the generall opinion of Divines, that God from all eternity fore-knows all things, and, That, there are a certain number

of persons determined by Him that shall be infallibly brought to glory. For declaring this Decree, they do go severall wayes. In the generall, they may be reduced to two: the way of *Absolute*; and the way of *Conditionall* Election. Of either way there are two sorts. In the Conditional way; The first sort do conceive, that God foresees who they be that will *live* godlily and keep his commandements, and them he chooses to salvation; while those he foresees will be wicked, he decrees to damnation. *Unde Apostolus* (say they), *Quos præscivit, hos & prædestinavit. From whence the Apostle Whom he did foreknow, them he also did prædestinate.* The second sort, perceiving this to be contrary to Scripture, which makes Election to be of *grace* & not of *works*, do say thus: That God foresees who they be will *beleeve*, and so choosing them as being in Christ through faith, decrees to give them grace, which will lead them to salvation: and those that he foresees will not believe, he decrees to leave them, as out of Christ, to Condemnation. *Non elegit Deus opera cujusque in præscientia quæ ipse daturus est; sed fidem elegit in præscientia, ut, quem sibi creditурum præscivit, Ipsum elegerit ut Spiritum sanctum daret, ut bona operando etiam vitam æternam consequerentur. God did not choose the works of any in his foresight which himself was to give, but he chose faith in his foresight, that, whom he foreknew would beleeve, he might choose them, to give the holy Spirit unto; that by doing good works they might obtain eternall salvation.* Augustine, *in libro expositionis quarundum propositionum ex epistola ad Romanos.* Again, *Quos Deus suos fidei opere futuros esse prænovit, hos prædestinavit ad gloriam. Those who God foreknew would become his through their beleeving, he elected unto glory. De prædestinatione Dei.* c. 5. The former opinion, is the way of the *Pelagian*; the latter, of the *Arminian*. Which yet I set not down after the more subtle times of *Arminius* himself, but those of *Augustine* according to these cited passages; the one of which he afterwards expressly retracted; and the book it self out of which I fetch the other, I beleeve either to be spurious, or to have got abroad from him unawares, before he had reveiwed it. The Orthodox therefore, such as we account the Synod of *Dort*, do declare for the *Absolute* way, in opposition to both these. To wit, that God, without consideration either of mans *faith*, or good *works*, but meerly

meerly according to *the counſell of his own will*, not rendring his reaſon to us, hath determined to give that grace to ſome perſons whereby they ſhall effectually be ſaved: and to leave others to the freedome of their own wills, that they may be judged at the laſt Day according to their deſerts. In this way, there are likewiſe two ſorts of Doctors. The one teach, that God looks on men without any conſideration of ſin at all, in their *ſtate before the Fall*, in this decree of his grace to ſome, and not to others: The other teach, that God looks indeed on men all alike without conſideration of *deſert*, but not without conſideration of *ſin*, to wit in their *faln eſtate*; and ſo decrees his mercy to ſome, and juſtice to others. Note here, that our Divines of the former ſort do not ſay, that, God decrees damnation to any without conſideration of ſin (nor ſalvation indeed without conſideration of faith and repentance): but, Decree's the giving or not giving ſaving grace to keep them from ſin and damnation, to whom he pleaſes, without any conſideration in man whatſoever. For, Predeſtination, ſay they, being an immanent and eternall act of the Divine underſtanding & will, cannot be conceived as dependent upon any foreſeen temporall acts of mans free-will. Note alſo, that St. *Auguſtine* who was the firſt ſet up for the *Abſolute* way, and yet not till his latter writings, doth declare for the ſecond ſort of this way. *Cæteri autem ubi niſi in maſſa perditionis juſto divino judicio relinquantur? The reſt that are not elect, are left according to Gods juſt judgment, in the maſſe of thoſe that are faln, unto perdition. De bono perſeverantiæ.* c. 14. The one of theſe opinions is called the *Supralapſarian* doctrine: the other, the *Sublapſarian*. Which are names indeed may make a rumbling to many that know not what they ſignify, but ſo long as they come into one and the ſame *Conſequent*, which alone is to be regarded, the difference is not of moment to diſturb any.

And what is the *Conſequent* then of theſe Doctrines, which is fit to be enquired? The *Conſequent* of the firſt doctrine, that Election is *ex præviſis operibus*, *of works foreſeen*, muſt be this, that the good life or good works of men therefore do ariſe from their own free wills, and that the grace of God is given according to their merits. This was the main opinion doubtleſs which the Church condemned in *Pelagius*. From whence indeed thoſe two

other followed, that, Man may therefore chooſe whether he will ever commit any ſin; and, That he muſt be free from original corruption. *Tria ſunt quæ maxime adverſus eos catholica defendit eccleſia, Unum eſt, Gratiam Dei non ſecundum merita dari, quoniam Dei dona ſunt. Alterum eſt, in quantacunque juſtitia ſine qualibuſcunq; peccatis neminem vivere. Tertium eſt, naſci homines peccato primi hominis obnoxios.* *There are three things eſpecially which the Catholick Church defends againſt the Pelagians: One is, that the Grace of God is not given according to mans merit: Another is, that there is no man, how great ſoever his righteouſneſs be, that lives without ſome ſins. The third is, that men are born liable to the guilt of Adams firſt tranſgreſſion.* De bon. perſev. c. 2. The conſequent of the ſecond opinion, that Election is *ex præviſa fide of fore-ſeen faith*, is, That although our *good works* are indeed the fruit onely of Gods Spirit, and to be aſcribed to Gods grace; yet muſt our *faith*, upon which the Spirit or this grace is given, or by which it is impetrated, as that Father ſpeaks, be both in our *own power* and from our *own will*; as being that, and that alone in man, that *makes the difference* between one and another; or the reaſon why God ſhould chooſe ſuch a one to give him his grace, and paſs by the other. And this *doctrine*, with the *Conſequent* of it, muſt be acknowledged to be St. *Auguſtine's* in his firſt writings, which he choſe no doubt as the moſt moderate then in the Church, which (as we may judg by *Proſper*, and *Hilary's* Epiſtles to him) was never uſed to define election otherwiſe than *ſecundum præſcientiam, according to foreknowledg*, till his dayes. And this was the reaſon that thoſe of *Marſilia* (*ad quorum authoritatem non ſumus pares*, ſayes one of thoſe Epiſtles, *quia multum nos et vitæ meritis antecellunt & ſacerdotis honore*) were ſo offended at that Father for his change. And from hence does *Arminius* profeſſe ſome-where, *Non ſtamus Auguſtino, We ſtand not with Auguſtine*: for which this alſo, as I remember, is his reaſon. *Quia ſibi ipſe non ſtetit, becauſe he ſtood not to himſelf.* The Conſequent of the other two doctrines which belong to *Abſolute* election, and come in this repect, I have ſaid, but to the *ſame*, is, on the contrary hand, That neither our *good works*, nor our *faith* it ſelf, nor indeed any good that is in man, is of our ſelves but of the operation of God, or of his Spirit, who does at firſt excite our wills to Faith and a holy

life,

life, & by his continual aſſiſtance carry us on in perſeverance unto the end, that we may be ſaved; ſo that, the whole buſineſs of our ſalvation firſt and laſt muſt be aſcribed to Him alone. And if any ask the reaſon then why he gives not the ſame grace to others as to his Elect, he ſhall find theſe words ſtill in St. *Auguſtine's* mouth. *And who art thou that repliest againſt God? May he not do what he will with his owne? Hath not the Potter power over his clay. O the depth of the knowledge and wiſdome of God, how unſearchable are his judgments, and his wayes paſt finding out!* It were but injury to quote a ſentence or two out of the Father for this, which is the deſigned contents of ſeverall of his laſt books. See *de Prædeſtinatione & gratia. De correptione & gratia. De prædeſtinatione ſanctorum. De bono perſeverantiæ*, to name no more.

The great difficulty now in this Conſequent of Election which appears, does undoubtedly lye here: *If neither the faith nor good works of man do ſpring from his own free will, but from the grace of God and Election, then may the unbeliever and wicked excuſe themſelves, and ſay, It is not long of themſelves that they believe not, nor obey, but the cauſe is in God who gives them not faith and obedience, and they cannot help their own reprobation.* They will not ſay that, Reprobation is any other than a *negative* decree, which infuſes no malice in them, but *it denyes them that grace which Election gives others: and, if it be not in their power to beleeve and repent without that grace, How can they be condemned for their not beleeving and repenting?* This difficulty I am aſſured did ſtick ſo faſt upon this Father in his *firſt* writings, that I do hardly think him quite out of the gravell in any of his *laſt*. Let us turn to his book *De ſpiritu & littera*. In his one and thirtieth Chapter, he offers the queſtion, *Whether faith be in mans power*, and determines that it is, and muſt be ſo? Upon this in his thirty third chapter he comes to another queſtion which is put to the quick, *Whether the will whereby he believes*, be therefore of *himſelf*, or of *God*? If it be not of our ſelves (ſayes he) but of Gods gift, then may man ſay (according to the objection propoſed) that he beleeved not, becauſe God gave him not the will. If it be of our ſelves, How can that text of the Apoſtle, *what haſt thou, O man, thou didſt not receive*, be true; ſeeing this *will* to beleeve he hath of himſelf?

For

For the extricating us out of this diſtreſſe, he yields to the firſt, and ſeems convinced, that faith muſt be both in our own *power*, and *of our ſelves*, for that reaſon. *Dicit Apoſtolus, Idem Deus qui operatur omnia in omnibus: nuſquam autem dictum eſt, Deus credit omnia in omnibus. Quod ergo credimus, noſtrum eſt: quod autem bonum operamur, illius eſt qui credentibus dat Spiritum ſanctum.* In his Expoſition upon the Romans. *The Apoſtle ſayes that God works all in all, but never that he beleeves all in all. That We beleeve therefore, it is of our ſelves: but that we do good works it is of him who gives his holy Spirit to them that beleeve.* To the laſt therefore he chooſes to anſwer; *Liberum arbitrium naturaliter attributum a Creatore animæ rationali, illa media vis eſt, quæ vel intendi ad fidem, vel inclinari ad infidelitatem poteſt. Et ideo, nec iſtam voluntatem qua credit Deo dici poteſt homo habere quam non acceperit, quandoquidem vocante Deo ſurgit de libero arbitrio quod naturaliter cum vocaretur accepit. Vult autem omnes homines ſalvos fore & in agnitionem veritatis venire, non ſic tamen ut eis adimat liberum arbitrium, quo vel bene vel male utentes juſtiſſime judicentur.* The ſubſtance is, that, *The will whereby we beleeve may be ſaid to be received of God, although it proceed from our ſelves, becauſe the faculty from whence it ariſes, is received from him*; that is, Becauſe the *nature* we have, is of our Creator, the *will* which is of *nature*, is of Him.

This does not ſatisfy me, for theſe reaſons. 1. That which the Father ſayes as to the *voluntas qua credimus*, *The will whereby we beleeve*, I take to be the ſame which *Pelagius* ſaid as to the *voluntas qua bene operamur*, *The will whereby we doe good works*. But if this text, and ſuch as this, be good againſt *Pelagius*, they muſt be good againſt *Auguſtine* here, that neither is our *faith* of our ſelves, upon the ſame account. The truth is, The judgment of this Father while he wrot this book, is this. The Spirit is given to a man upon his beleeving. This Spirit infuſes grace, charity, or juſtification. This charity is that which diſpoſes to good works. *Good works* therefore (he counts) muſt be of grace and Gods ſpirit, and to follow juſtification which is with him this infuſed grace: But as for *beleeving* which is the firſt thing upon which the Spirit it ſelf is given to infuſe this grace, from whence our good works doe ſpring; this muſt ariſe, he accounts, from mans free will, or

elſe

elſe the fault will not be in himſelf (which is the argument convinces him), but it muſt lye on the will of God onely, that he hath not the ſpirit, and ſo no grace, and ſo does not well, and is not ſaved. Whether this argument be irrefragable or no, we ſhall ſee by what will follow. 2. There are two queſtions raiſed together by the Apoſtle, *Who maketh thee to differ from another?* and, *What haſt thou, O man, that thou didſt not receive?* The chief difficulty lyes in anſwering the former queſtion; for, by that is the *ſecond* to be regulated. Now if that we have from God is onely this *middle faculty*, which we may uſe to *beleeve*, or *not*, Who is it makes the difference in one mans uſing it to *faith*, and another's to *infidelity*! That which is the *leſs*, the *Poſſe velle*, *The power to will* ſhall be of God (that is, of Nature, and ſo of God): but the *Ipſum velle*, *The will or willing it ſelf*, which is the *greater*, and which indeed ſaves us, ſhall be of our ſelves. 3. The Scripture is expreſs concerning faith. — *and that not of our ſelves, it is the gift of God.* If the word τοῦτο, there, referrs to the whole ſentence, we have other texts. *No man cometh to me*, that is, beleeveth in me *unleſs the Father draw him. To you it is given not only to believe, but to ſuffer for his name. This is the work of God that you beleeve. Who hath firſt given to him? Of him and to him are all things. I obtained mercy That I ſhould be faithfull*, not Becauſe I was faithfull. *But ye beleeve not, becauſe ye are not of my ſheep.* Again, *As many as were ordained to ſalvation, beleeved.* It ſeems here that the cauſe why ſome *beleeve* and ſome beleeve *not*, is their being, or not being of the number of thoſe who are *ordained* to be of his *flock*. The like text in reference to *works*, as theſe to *faith*, is that to the Epheſians, *He hath choſen us in him before the foundation of the world that we ſhould be holy.* It is not therefore mans *faith* or *holineſs* is the cauſe of Gods *Election*, but it is Gods *election* is the cauſe of mans *holineſs* and *faith*. A prime and eternal cauſe (ſay our Divines) cannot depend upon the ſelf ſame temporal effects which are thereby cauſed. If therefore the Ordination of God be the cauſe from whence mans faith and *holineſs* are derived; his foreſeen-faith, or foreſeen-works are not to be imagined antecedent cauſes, merits, conditions, or motives unto the Divine Predeſtination. 4. We have St. *Auguſtine* acknowledging himſelf to have bin herein in an errour: So that theſe arguments muſt be

no longer againſt *Auguſtine*, but againſt thoſe who have taken up that opinion he forſook. *In nullo gloriandum eſt, dixit Cyprianus, quoniam noſtrum nihil ſit. Quod ut oſtenderet adhibuit Apoſtolum, Quid autem habes, quod non accepiſti? Quo præcipue teſtimonio convictus ſum cum errarem, putans fidem qua in Deum credimus, non eſſe donum Dei, ſed a nobis eſſe in nobis: & per illam nos impetrare Dei dona, quibus temperanter, & juſte, & pie vivamus in hoc ſeculo. Quem errorem nonnulla opuſcula mea ſatis indicant.* It was the ſaying of bleſſed Cyprian, that we may glory in nothing, becauſe that which is ours is nothing. This he proved by the words of the Apoſtle. By which teſtimony I was firſt convinced when I erred, thinking that faith was of our ſelves, and then good works obtained by it. Which errour ſeveral of my former pieces do ſufficiently ſhew. *De prædeſtinatione ſanctor.* c. 3. I wiſh he had mentioned the book here which I am citing, as he does one or two other, that I might have known his ſolution to the difficulty which himſelf hath urged, but left unanſwered upon our hands.

To return then to the Father's queſtion, Whether the *Voluntas qua credimus*, The will whereby we beleeve, be of our ſelves, or God's gift? I muſt not chooſe the *firſt* with him in that book, but the *laſt* according to other of his works. Nevertheleſs, we muſt carefully diſtinguiſh the two things whereof he hath made two queſtions, *Utrum fides in noſtra conſtituta ſit poteſtate*, Whether faith be in our power, in one chapter: and, *Utrum voluntas qua credimus donum ſit Dei, an ex libertate arbitrii*, Whether the will whereby we do beleeve, be the gift of God, or the effect of our own liberty, in another. I do apprehend here, that both theſe two things are to be held, That faith is in our power, and That the will whereby we beleeve is not of our ſelves, but of Gods grace or gift. The holding both theſe is that which cuts the thread of all difficulties in this matter. For the one, That faith is in *mans power*, we are beholding verily to that Father. A thing is in a mans power, which he may do if he will. *Hanc dicimus poteſtatem, ubi voluntati adjacet facultas faciendi.* When he accounts Faith then to be in mans power, he underſtands this, That he may beleeve if he will. And this is a truth of great neceſſity, yet hath difficulty: But when he proceeds hereupon ſo farre, as to make the *will* therefore *where-*

by

by we beleeve to be *of our ſelves*, it was a ſtep which himſelf ſaw need, to draw back. There are many things that are *poſſible*, which yet never *ſhall be*, as this Father himſelf gives inſtances of, upon another occaſion, in the firſt chapter of this book. There are likewiſe many things which a man *can* do, that yet he never *will*, or is like to do without ſome ſpeciall cauſe moving him to it. Such is the buſineſs of mans Converſion. There is no man (we are to hold with him) but he may *beleeve*, I will adde, *repent*, and be *ſaved*, if he *will*: yet is this to be known and held alſo, That there is no man for certain ever *will*, unleſs it be from that one ſpecial cauſe which is Gods grace, or the Spirit's motion that works his heart thereunto. Now then, Shall a man remain an unbeleever, and impenitent and periſh, the fault ſhall lye upon himſelf, and God ſhall be juſt, becauſe we place faith in his own *power*. He may believe, and repent, and be ſaved, if he *will*. If God *would* and he *will not*, he may thank himſelf. Again, if he do believe, and repent, and is ſaved, he ſhall have no cauſe to boaſt or glory in himſelf, becauſe that though he might believe and repent if he would, yet *would* he never have repented while the world laſted, he would have bin damn'd firſt, if it had not bin for the grace of God that wrought him over, after he had ſtood ſo long out. And this is a ſad truth I grant, which needs not the proof of one or two ſingle texts, when the ſcope of the whole Scripture which attributes our *deſtruction* to our *ſelves*, and our life and *help* unto *God*, does ſeal to it. *Who is it hath made thee to differ? Of him we have the will and the deed. By grace, ye are ſaved.*

You may ſay, If the *will* then be of God, why does he not give the *will*, as well as the *power* to all, ſeeing he would have all men to be ſaved? I anſwer in the firſt place what *Auguſtine* hath before, that God will have all men to be ſaved and come to the knowledge of the truth; but yet ſo as the free will of man be not deſtroyed. My meaning though, is not as I take the Father's to be there, as if the *will in believeing* could not be of God (of unwilling making man willing) but this freedome were loſt; when I doubt not but the caſe is the ſame in *believeing* as in *well-doing*, where mans free will, and Gods grace, would ſtand together alwayes in his account. I ſay farther, God will have all to be ſaved in vouchſafing the *means* to all, to be *ſaved if they will*. This ap-

peares in these three particulars. 1. That he hath given his Son to dye for all the world. 2. The Lord Jesus hath by his death procured the New Covenant, or such termes upon which Salvation may be had, as are *possible* to all the World. This is a point to be known, that there is this difference between the Covenant of *Works*, under which we are by Nature, and the Covenant of *Grace*, unto which we are Redeemed; that, The condition of the one, as to our false Estate is *Impossible*, and the condition of the other is *Possible*. If it be not possible, or in Mans *Power* to perform if he will, then hath Christ done nothing for the World, but died onely for his Elect. For, To procure a Benefit on a Condition that is impossible, is all one, as to procure no Benefit at all. 3. There is sufficient light by the Gospel, or by other means from *within* and *without*, to instruct all men, so that if they be not wanting to that Light, they may be saved: And thus are we to make good this Truth, God will have all to be saved, *if they will of themselves*; which yet doth not hinder, but he may will the Salvation of some more than so, that is, not only if they Will of *themselves*; but if they Will by his *Grace*, which he gives, or refuses to whom he pleases. *Cur autem illum adjuvet Deus, illum non adjuvet: Illum tantum, illum non tantum; istum illo, illum isto modo, penes ipsum est, & aquitatis tam secreta ratio, & excellentia potestatis.* *But why He helps this man, and not that? this man so much, and that man not so much; this man one way, that man another; we must leave it to Him, whose Power and Wisdom is above our reach.* *De peccatorum meritis & remissione*, l. 2. c. 5.

I know indeed, The Scripture speaks ordinarily of a *Cannot*; but there is a *Cannot* which denotes an *Impossibility*, and a *Cannot* which denotes an *Indisposition* onely. In the Parables, the Steward says *he cannot digg*; and the Man in Bed, he *cannot rise*. In the same sense the Scripture says, *We cannot come to Christ, unless we be Drawen*; and *we cannot learn to do well, that are accustomed to do evil*. When a man is so disposed against any thing, as that he certainly never will do it under that disposition, it is common for us to say *he cannot*; as of the Idle person, we say, *he cannot work*; of the Abstemious, *he cannot drink*. The Scripture accommodates it self to our Language: *He that is born of God, cannot sin*, sayes the Apostle: That is, he is under that disposition

through

through the *New Nature*, that he can no more find in his heart to live in any deliberate courſe of ſin, than the Wicked can endure to come up to an Univerſal unreſerved Reſignation of himſelf unto God. Thus are we to underſtand ſuch Texts. St. *Auguſtine*, I remember, in the book laſt quoted, which he perſues, *De ſpiritu & litera*, is very wary of denying a *Poſſibilty* to a man, even of living without ſin, when he is induſtrioufly proving that none in Earth but do ſin; and there are ſome learned Divines ſtand much on this, that we have our *faculties*, and the *object* ſufficily *propoſed*; and therefore a *Natural Power* to every thing which is our duty. But the Father is more cautious, who diſtinguiſhes between what we can do by *Nature*, and what by *Grace*: *Without me*, ſayes Chriſt, *ye can do nothing*; and *through Him*, ſayes the Apoſtle, *I am able to do all things*. By *Grace* he thinks it ſafeſt to hold that *Poſſible*, which by *Nature*, or to our bare natural ſtrength and faculties, he doubts-not to count *Impoſſible*. There is a *medium* therefore between both. They that dare ſay, If it be the duty of a man that is without Grace, to live perfectly, it is poſſible; or, That it is in the power of man, in the ſtate of Nature, without Grace, to keep all Gods Commandements, and live without ſin, becauſe it is his *Duty*, are too boyſterous on the one hand; for, *Auguſtine* does manifeſtly account this to be the extreameſt Pelagianiſm; and the Father, I count, in framing this diſtinction for this purpoſe, is too tender on the other. It is true, a man hath his Natural Faculties, and the Object may be revealed, but theſe faculties are corrupt and unſutable to the object. There is *Nature* then, and *corrupt Nature*. The Scripture ſpeaks of Man as he *is*; and that is impoſſible to *Falne Nature*, which to *Original Nature* was poſſible. The Law it ſelf nevertheleſs, being founded in Gods Nature, and Man as Created after his Image; is unchangable, and cannot ceaſe to require of all men, what it did at firſt of *Adam*, when given in Innocency. It is the duty conſequently of every body, whether he hath Grace, or hath not, To keep this perfect Law of our Maker entire; but we are not to affirm it to be *Poſſible*, or within the power of any whatſoever. No certainly, ſeeing the Scripture tells us ſo often, and ſo flatly, that, *By the deeds of the Law, no fleſh living ſhall be juſtified*: Seeing there is no man but is born in original-ſin, which he cannot help,

help; and the Apostle calls Concupiscence, sin; and seeing the Grace of God, or the Spirit, is not given to any for their fulfilling the *Law of Works*, but the *Law of Grace* (which is a point not considered on by *Augustine*, I take it, and most others), we must choose rather to say that the whole duty indeed of man, according to the Law of Works, (take it together) is *Impossible*; for, so does the Apostle, I account, intend in that expression, τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός. That is as much as to say, *The Law in that, through the weakness of the flesh, none is able to perform it, cannot possibly justifie any.* The impossibility lying on *us* in regard to the performance, not in *it*. True, it were possible through such an extraordinary measure of the Spirit as the Man-Christ had (not to leave *Augustine* quite), but that measure being not to be given to any body else, it is best said, to be *Impossible*, even by the strength of *Nature*, & by *Grace* (according to its ordinary measure on Earth) *Impossible*; when yet, as for the terms of the *Law of Faith*, I hold it fit still, to say, they are *Possible* to all; though there is none *do* perform them, but by *Grace*.

Upon this, there is one thing needs must yet be spoken to, for it hath stuck some time upon my self. It is this; when *Augustine* is telling us that Faith is in our power, he offers us this Reason, Because a man may believe, or not believe, he accounts what he will. *Hoc quisque in potestate habere dicitur, quod, si vult, facit; si non vult, non facit. Vide nunc utrum quisquam credat si noluerit, aut non credat si voluerit. That every man is said to have in his power, which, if he will, he does; and, if he will not, he does not. Consider now, whether there be any that believe if they will not, or do not believe if they will.* The contrary to this I judg is certain, that there are some things I *cannot* believe though I *would*, and some things that I cannot but believe, though I would *not* never so fain. From whence I should oppose therefore that *Faith* then, whatsoever else is, cannot be in mans *Power*, no more than it is of his own *Will*. For satisfaction to which, I acknowledg that there are Doctrines or Propositions which are true, that many a man cannot believe if he will; nay, perhaps some Articles that the Ancients have imposed as necessary to Salvation. I say, I acknowledg that a man cannot make himself to believe what he will, nor otherwise than he does believe; nevertheless, I do apprehend that that-Faith,

which

which is the condition of the covenant of grace is indeed in mans power. I apprehend that whereas the conditions of the Covenant of grace are, and muſt be, ſuch as are poſſible, there is no man who believes as much as he *can*; but his *will* ſhall be accepted for whatſoever is required more, which he *cannot*, and which is not *given*. Or elſe we had as good have bin left ſtill to the covenant of works. The condition then of the Covenant of grace, or thoſe terms which remain of neceſſity to ſalvation, does not lye in an aſſent to every doctrine and article which is true in the Chriſtian religion, but to ſo much as ſerves to bring a man unto Chriſt, or unto God, *Without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, for he that comes unto him muſt beleeve that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him.* And ſuch a faith as this, will the light of Nature inſtruct every man to. Though where the Goſpel is preached, the beliefe of Chriſt alſo, in his perſon, offices, word, and works, will and muſt neceſſarily follow, ſeeing, *To whom much is given, of him ſhall much be required. Ye beleeve in God, beleeve alſo in mee. Unleſs ye beleeve I am he, ye ſhall dye in your ſins.* Now, let us bring that faith a man has to the teſt. If my beleeving of God, or Chriſt, that he will be good to me if I repent, does produce this repentance, then is my faith ſaving and effectual: if it do not, then is the fault in my *will*. When it lyes on my will then, it is in my *power*: yet if I will I muſt hold it to be ſtill of the grace of God. *Huc valere debet tota Dei notitia* (ſayes *Calvin*), *ut omne bonum ab illo petere, & illi acceptum ferre diſcamus. To this purpoſe does the whole knowledge of God which is taught us in Scripture conduce, that we ſhould learne to ſeek all our good at his hands, and live in the return of our thank-fulneſs to him.*

When God *made* man, he muſt know the end of his *work*. He muſt foreſee what man will do, what his poſterity will do, all that they will do, the end of all. When God foreſees the actions of man, it muſt be conceived in the order of nature that they will *be*, before he foreſees them: and, if they will be, they muſt have ſome *cauſe*, and that cauſe muſt depend on the firſt Cauſe, and ſo all be reſolved into God's will. It is true, that he foreſees alſo what is *poſſible* as well as *future*: but a thing is poſſible only, becauſe he wills it not; & future becauſe he wills it. I ſay not, that this inferrs a *Phyſical determinate influx* into every act of man, which, proceeding from his free-

freewill is ſometimes good and ſometimes evill: it is ſufficient that there is ſuch a complexion of circumſtances provided, as that a *vaga moralis infallibilitas, a morall indetermined certainty* as to the event, ſhall ariſe out of the whole together, according to his eternal counſel. As for ſin or evill; it is a defect of Entity or good, a *privative* no *poſitive* thing, and ſo is of our *ſelves*, and not of *Him*, as *Auguſtine* againſt the *Manichees, and the Schools* after him have it. What followes now upon this, but that there is not an *act* of a mans whole *life*, or *will*, ſo farre as either *ſub genere Entis*, or *ſub genere Morum* it is *good*, but it muſt be of God.

And what then is there to mate that Father's doctrine of Election, as it is laid on this fonndation? Let us give the mind its greateſt liberty. One may think. As there are ſome things which are *not poſſible*, & it is no derogation to Gods *power* to ſay he *cannot do* them: ſo may there be ſome things *non ſcibilia, not knowable*, & it ſhall not derogate from his *Omniſciency* to ſay he *foreknows not* them. Such things as are left altogether to the will of a free agent, may be thought ſuch. There are ſome things depend on mans will, which God *determines*; and here hee foreknows mens wills, becauſe he *knowes* as well as *does*, whatſoever he *will*: and there are ſome things depend on mans will which we are to conceive that he determines *not*, but will have *contingent*; and here to make God ſuch a one as that he muſt foreſee every thing whether he will or no, and that a *contingent* to him ſhall be impoſſible though he would have a *contingent*, does ſeem to be an affront to his Majeſtie, rather than a perfection. To this purpoſe we read that when God ſaw that *the thoughts of mans heart were evill continually*, it is ſaid *it repented him that he made man*. And we have many expreſſions of the like import. O that my people had bin thus and thus, or would be thus and thus! *Thou art a gracious God, and mercifull, ſlow to anger, and of great kindneſs, and repenteſt thee of the evill.* And why may we not frame our notion of God from ſuch texts of Scripture as theſe, as well as from others, and rather than from the definition of the Schools? Eſpecially if we can make God more lovely to our ſelves & more adorable, than by their conceptions. There is nothing that God does will *now*, but what he did decree *alway*. And why ſo? Becauſe, the Schools ſay, there will elſe be *compoſition* in God, the compoſition of an *eſſence* and *acci-*

dent

dent, and God is a *pure act*, *& ens ſimpliciſſimum*. But what if the Conceptions of thoſe holy men, who would have God like to man in regard of the Scripture *expreſſions* (wherein they were ſo zealous, as we have a famous Eccleſiaſtical ſtory about it), ſhould not be ſo injurious on one hand to the Almighty, as ſuch Conceptions as theſe on the other, which do quite puzzle our Intellectuals, and leave us without any quick ſenſe at all of him? It is certain that God is *Good*, *Righteous*, *Unchangeable*: but we muſt have a Conception of goodneſs, righteouſneſs and unchangeableneſs, and that which is *agreeable* to that herein, which we eſteem *perfections* in our ſelves, before we attribute them to him. When we make God then to be always gracious to thoſe that do well, and diſpleaſed with evil, and ſo brings, or determines to bring a *Judgment* on one, and beſtows a *Bleſſing* on another, according as he ſees at the preſent the *Provocation* of the one, and *Obedience* of the other, without any other *determination before*, beſides that of his *Law*; why is not this an *Unchangeableneſs*, more worthy the *Divine Excellence*, than that, by which he being conceived a *pure act*, muſt be made never to will any thing elſe, than what he wills at once from all Eternity?

Upon the like Hypotheſis as this, one may alſo propoſe a ſutable notion of Prædeſtination. To wit, that the Scripture being skanned to the bottom, Election perhaps may be found indeed nothing elſe but Gods determination to ſave Men and Women by the Covenant of Grace, and not by the Covenant of our Creation, or by the *Righteouſneſs of God* declared in the Goſpel, and not by the *Righteouſneſs of Works*. This definition ſhould be founded on ſuch Texts, where the *purpoſe of God, according to Election*, is ſaid to be *not of Works, but of him that calleth*. And, *He hath called us not according to our works, but according to his purpoſe and Grace*. It ſhould be founded alſo on the inſtances of *Iſaack* and *Jacob*, in whom *the Children of the Promiſe* are Elected, in oppoſition to *the Children of the fleſh*; that is, thoſe that look for Juſtification by the deeds of the Law. And thus have we the example of the Jews rejection upon that account. And thus when a Phariſee hath lived ſo Righteouſly, that as to the whole *Law* he is *blameleſs*, and ſo truſts to *his Righteouſneſs*, ſhall ſay, And why am I rejected for all this, and ſuch a Publican onely for his repenting and truſting on the mercy of God, through Chriſt is ac-

cepted? it may be answered, the reason is plain, because it is *God* that *makes the difference*, by decreeing and appointing what *terms* he pleases, upon which one shall be saved, and not another. *Hath not the Potter power over his Clay*, of what *sort* he will, to make Vessels of *honour* and *dishonour*? so that it is not *of him that Willeth, or Runneth*; it is not upon such terms as a man himself sets, or would set, of *works*; but it is of *Grace*, of *him that sheweth mercy*. Well! But what would be the *Consequent* of such Doctrine as this? Why the *Consequent*, no doubt, must be the same in effect with the Pelagian, which is *Universal Grace*, and *Free-will* to purpose. But I confess my self to have imbibed the Doctrine of St *Augustine* from my younger years, that I am convinced by it, believing that nothing can be set up against it with any strength, which is short of *Vorstius*; while *Pelagius* and *Vorstius* both, are names we know that do so *male audire*, *Are of such ill report* in the Church, as the *Arminians* themselves will not bear. For our apprehensions then of God, according to the Schools, it must be acknowledged, that he is said in holy Scripture, to *dwell in the Clouds and thick darkness*; and into such darkness, or those Clouds, will I account indeed that he is put, while he is made to be *actus purus*, and wrapt in their notions, which if they served no other, they do yet serve this end; even most reverendly and exceedingly to hide him from us, and render him thereby, but as he is, very truly incomprehensible to us.

To reflect then back on the difficulty before, as to the *Consequent* of Election our way, if any say they are not satisfied with what I have said, because a power never produced into act, is as good as none. I answer, if I propose *that* which they *would* have, and it be all *can* be had, there is a *measure* in things, which when we have set in any point so, as the Determination cannot be passed, but we shall run into the extreams on one side, or the other, which we seek to avoid, we ought to be satisfied. Especially when such a power alone as this, which in the *effect*, without Grace, is *none*, will do our work. If we allow not a power to man, how shall God be just, how shall God condemn any (which is that lyes at bottome still of of what is said) for not doing that which was not in his *power*, or which was not *possible*? If when a man hath *Power*, he does also exert that power, and *wills* of himself; how shall such Scriptures

tures be true which have been urged? *It is God that makes us to differ. Of him we have the Will and the Deed:* Nay, ſuch Texts more eſpecially, as ſpeak expreſly of a *Cannot*, when the true intent and meaning of them is this, that we *do not*, and never *will* (as I have had it before) till God prevents us by his effectual Grace. Without Chriſt we can do nothing. All our ſufficiency is of God: No man can come to him unleſs he be drawen. *Si non eſt liberum arbitrium quomodo Deus judicabit mundum? Si eſt liberum arbitrium, quomodo ſalvabit mundum? If man have not Free-will, how ſhall God judg him? If he have, how ſhall he ſave him?* This is the difficulty of the Father. If then there be ſuch a *liberum arbitrium* to be found out, which *quodam modo* is *ſine libero arbitrio*, ſuch a *power*, as in the effect is no *power*; that is, ſuch as without Grace (which alſo is efficacious) comes to nothing, then can we decide this buſineſs for him. Suppoſe a Magiſtrate for ſome fault ſhall cut off a Malefactors hands, and then command him to write, and promiſe him great things if he will, and threaten him if he do not write, can we think this Magiſtrate ſerious? Is this becoming a righteous and good man? If you grant not man to have power, why do you *Preach*? why do you *Exhort*? If you will give him more than this (I muſt perſiſt), why do you *Pray*? why do you ask Grace of God? what is it to ask his Grace, but that God would incline the will? *Aiunt quorſum vocare hominem ad præſtandam conditionem quam implere nequeat? It is objected, why are men called to that condition they cannot perform? Reſpondeo, poſſe, & non poſſe eam implere. Non poſſunt niſi datur poſſe poſſunt tamen quia quod non poſſunt, pravitati eorum debetur.* I *anſwer* (ſayes *Cottyer*), *They cannot, if it were not* given (that which is onely of Nature is given), *but they can, becauſe it is to be attributed to their wickedneſs alone, that they* cannot. *They can, and they cannot*, Thus others ſay: *They can, and they wont* I ſay. Onely in regard this *wont* is never changed in any, but by ſpecial Grace; the Scripture (I have ſaid) calls it a *can't*. That is, it is a *can* in it ſelf, but a *can't* in the effect; it being in effect all one when you *never will*, as if you *could* not. What? when the Scripture ſayes, they can't, do I then ſay, they can? yes, becauſe my *can, and never will* (I affirm) is the Scriptures *can't*. *But there are ſome of you believe not. Therefore I*

ſaid unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it be given him. Some of you, notwithſtanding all my Preaching and Miracles, *believe not*; therefore I ſaid unto you, you *can't*. And this interpretation (I muſt adde) accords with the Ancients. *Non potuerunt, hoc eſt noluerunt. Ita nonnunquam poteſtate pro voluntate utitur.* Chryſoſtome *on* Jo. 12. 39. So Auguſtine. *Non poterant quia nolebant, quippe eorum voluntatem prævidit Deus.* Hoc *autem quod dicit, non potuerunt credere, ſignificat, noluerunt. Nam malus & improbus homo non poteſt crede e quam diu talis fuerit, mala ſcilicet eligens & volens* Thophylact. *Mundus odiſſe vos non poteſt, & Quomodo poteſtis bona loqui cum ſitis mali? Quo pacto quidquam horum impoſſibile eſt, niſi quod voluntas repugnat?* Nazienzen. *Impoſſibile dicitur quod, rariſſime contingit*, according to one, *quod difficilime perficitur* according to another. See *Ruiz* on that head, *Impoſſibilitatem bene operandi Patres abhorrent, etiam quamdiu illam ſonat expreſſe cortex Scripturæ. Ad quæſt* 23, *&* 24. *Ex parte prima S. Thomæ. Diſp.* 39. *Sec.* 8.

And here I cannot but *inſert* the *mention* of a late *Diſcourſe* about *Natural* and *Moral Impotency*, or *Natural* and *Ethical power*, which terms do expreſs this *can* and *cannot* with ſo much dexterity, though my ſelf uſe them not, becauſe my Papers were on the Anvil before that book came out. And there is ſomthing therefore, I find, I have already, and after, puts me in mind *of two things* I want in that ſingular pretty Tract. One is, a little more tenderneſs in that inculcated aſſertion. *The more moral Impotency, the more inexcuſable.* I believe the Author was himſelf of a healthfull mind, and not ſenſible of thoſe imbred inclinations, and ſicklineſs which ſome ſoul are born with, & no ſtrivings againſt it will utterly ſubdue, till death. There are beſides certain impreſſions and wounds ſometimes on the *imagination* that are incurable. I do not doubt now, but God, who is moſt wiſe and good, *who knoweth our frame* (as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks), *and remembreth we are but Duſt*, will conſider the ſeveral Conditions, Complexions, and Temptations that every man is obnoxious to in this life; and that there will be *grains of allowance* for *ſome moral Impotency* at the laſt day. *Non ſine magna noſtra utilitate relinquitur nobis materia certaminum ut humilietur ſanctitas, dum pulſatur infirmitas. It is not without our great benefit, that God does leave in his Children, matter.*

ter for their ſpiritual Combat, that they may be humbled in their Piety, while they are aſſaulted with their infirmity. Ambroſe. *De vocatione gentium.* The other thing I want, is, a diſtinction in regard to that principle of his, and indeed foundation, which he inſiſts ſo much upon throughout the book. *That which is our duty muſt be poſſible.* It is certain that *perfection* is ſtill our duty; and it is enough for us onely to make whatſoever is neceſſary to our Salvation to be in our power. Diſtinguiſh we muſt therefore between the *Law of Works*, and the *Covenant of Grace.* We are indeed to maintain the condition of the *one* to be *poſſible* for good reaſon; but as for what is required in the *other*, though it be ſtill our duty, and muſt remain ſo eternally (for Good and Evil according to Nature, can never be changed), we are not to deny in our ſalne ſtate, to be *impoſſible.* Which hath been before Noted.

To return, There is a point near a kinn to the matter in hand, of great difficulty, what part the *will* of man does bear in our good acts. That the beginning of all that is good, comes from God, who by his *preventing* Grace, works in us at firſt (as the Schools ſpeak) *without us*; and, That when the will is excited, he does work alſo *with us*, by his *operating*, or *co operating* Grace, as the principal cauſe ſtill, and conſequently, That the whole good which is done, upon that account, is to be attributed to him, we ſhall find yeilded by the *School men*, as well as tendred by St. *Auguſtine*, *Proſper*, *Fulgentius*, and the like Fathers. *Totum bonum eſt Deo tribuendum, quia totum Deus operatur.* See *Ruiz. De Deo operante*; *& libero arbitrio.* Sec. 1. On the other hand, That being *acted*, we *act*, and ſo concur with Gods Grace; That it is *we* Believe, Repent, and not God: *We* that work out our Salvation, though he gives the will and the deed: *We* who walk in his Statutes, though he puts his fear in our hearts to do it: and ſo *We* accordingly, who are bid to *make our ſelves new hearts*, which is his work out of queſtion; this is alſo undeniable in Scripture. *Deus eſt qui operatur.---cum procul dubio, ſi homo ratione utatur, non poſſit credere, ſperare, diligere, niſi velit: nec pervenire ad palmam, niſi voluntate cucurrerit. It is God works in us, when beyond doubt, there is no man uſes his Reaſon, but it is himſelf alſo that wills.* Aug. Enchir. c. 32. *Ut velimus, & ſuum eſſe voluit & noſtrum, ſuum vocando, noſtrum ſequendo,* in another book. It

is

is God then according to the determination of the ſchools, that is the *principal* cauſe, and the will of man the *leſs principal*, partiall, *ſecundary* cauſe, of our good actions. His part indeed is ſuch to which all the glory is due, and yet ours ſuch as the good works are reckoned ours, and we ſhall be rewarded for them at the laſt day. When *Calvin* therefore ſeems here to oppoſe, I find him thus treated. *Supponebat hæreticus hominis arbitrium ita divina prædeſtinatione regi, ut quamvis operetur ſpontanee, nihil tamen agat cum poteſtate non agendi. ſed agatur Dei operatione, That heritick* Calvin (ſaies the now named learned Jeſuit out of Stapleton) *ſuppoſed the free will of man to be ſo governed by prædeſtination, that though it does act ſpontaneouſly, yet it acts not with a power of not acting, but it is acted by the operation of God.* Well! what is the difference between them? Does *Calvin* indeed go to evacuate that *free-will* man hath by nature? no ſuch matter. Does he make the *will* to act ſo by Gods operation, as to have no operation of its own? I think not ſo. But I will tell you where the water ſticks. It ſticks between the *Schools* and *Calvin*, where it does between the *Arminians* and *Calviniſts*, and that is upon the point altogether of *reſiſtibility* or *irreſiſtibility*. The work of grace is underſtood by *Calvin* and the *Calviniſts* to be ſuch, as leaves not any *power* in the *will* to reſiſt, or of not acting. They doe ſtand ſo much on the bare term of Gods *drawing* us, as it leads them to ſpeak with exceſs. The truth therefore is to be thus decided. We are to hold with the Schools and *Arminians*, that the *will* hath ſtill power to reſiſt, or not to act, for mans nature is deſtroyed elſe: but we are to hold with the *Calviniſt*, that though it hath power, it never will, or does reſiſt, but will moſt certainly *act*, when it is *acted* by Gods electing grace. As in the caſe before of the *Reprobate* (I have ſaid), a man hath *Power* to beleeve, and repent, ſo that it is his fault, and he is juſtly condemned, if he do not, when yet he never *will*, for want of this grace: So in the caſe of the *Elect*, a man hath power to reſiſt, and not to act, but he will beleeve and repent infallibly, and never reſiſt, when he is wrought upon by it. The reaſon is, becauſe God by his *prædeſtination* of ſuch a perſon to life, does prepare a *Vocation* ſo *Fit*, and ſuited to his temper, condition, and the circumſtances he is in, as it ſhall inevitably carry the *will* (which by the way does recon-

cile

cile the *Certainty* of the one, with the *Liberty* of the other, according to St. *Auguſtine's* intention), when the ſame means ſhall be uſed to a perſon not elect, but being not ſuited to his ſtate, they have no ſuch event: Even as the ſame phyſick given to two bodys diverſly diſpoſed, hath an operation upon one, and does the other no good. In ſhort, the grace of God is *reſiſtible* with the *Arminians*, in regard of *power*: it is *irreſiſtible* with the *Calviniſts*, in regard of the *effect*. The *will* does ever retain its *Phyſical power* to act, or not act; when yet it is made *Ethically impotent* (to uſe once the Authour before) to reſiſt. *Quisquis audet dicere, habeo ex me ipſo fidem, non ergo accepi, profecto contradicit apertiſſimæ veritati: non quia credere vel non credere non eſt in arbitrio voluntatis, ſed in electis præparatur voluntas a domino. If any dare ſay I have faith of my ſelf, and therefore did not receive it, he does for certain contradict the truth. Not becauſe that to believe or not beleeve is not in the power of the will, but in the Elect the will is prepared of God.* *Aug.* De Prædeſ. Sanc. *c.* 5. We may add St. *Ambroſs* (or *Proſper* rather). *Qui ad obediendum ſibi ipſum velle ſic donat, ut etiam a perſeveraturis illam mutabilitatem, quæ poteſt nolle, non auferat.* In one of his two books, *De vocatione gentium.*

The ſumm is, where a man beleeves, repents, and is converted, the *difference* is *made* between him and the reprobate. This is *actuall*, or *created* prædeſtination. Man concurrs in this work: nevertheleſs, in regard that it is not through his own ſtrength, or through that grace which is univerſal, or *common* to the *Reprobate* with the *Elect*, but through that grace which is peculiar and prepared by *increated* predeſtination for him, it is not of himſelf, but of God, that he is *made to differ*. And if it be granted, that it is in his power to hinder the difference, while grace is making of it, ſeeing it is in his power ſtill not to act: but yet be aſſerted alſo, that the decree working Infallibly, carrys the *will*, that it never is, or ſhall be hindered when that works: I do not ſee but this controverſie about *Gods operation*, and *mans free will*, may be agreed. *How is it ſaid* (ſayes *Auguſtine*), *it is not of him that willeth or runneth, but of God that ſheweth mercy? If it were to be underſtood onely becauſe it is of both, then might we ſay it is not of God likewiſe that ſheweth mercy, but of him that willeth and runs. But when no Chriſtian dare ſay ſo, it remains* (ſayes he) *to be ſo under-*

underſtood, Ut totum Deo detur, qui homini voluntatem bonam & præparat adjuvandam, & adjuvat præparatam; That the whole be given to God, who both fits the will for his help, & then helps it, being made fit. Enchiridion ad Laurentium, c. 32.

As for the *way* of the Papiſts, that is, which the Trent Councel does tread, it ſeems to me verily an *invented, forced* way. They would avoid the cenſure of *Auguſtine*, and former Councels which condemned *Pelagius*, yet in effect do entend but the ſame thing. They ſay, therefore, that God does vouchſafe his grace to all; with this grace ſome *co operate*, and ſome do not. Thoſe that will co-operate with it God fore-ſees, and præleſtinates them: thoſe that co-operate not, he rejects and condemns. By this means they will avoid making their own works to be the cauſe of their Election, ſeeing they can attribute all to this ſufficient aſſiſtance; when yet the *conſequent* of their opinion comes to one, that it muſt lye in the *will of* man which *co operates*, or *co-operates* not with this aſſiſtance, to *make the difference*, why *one* is choſen and ſaved, and not the *other*. That which is ſaid by the *Pelagian*, placing Grace only in *Doctrine*, or the *Goſpel*, is more ſingle I take it than this. It is true, there are ſome others beſides the Papiſts, are willing to hold Election to be of *Works*, or of *Faith foreſeen*, who will yet deny the *Conſequent*, that our Faith, and and good Works therefore muſt ariſe from our own free wills, and be meritorious; becauſe they will ſuppoſe them ſo foreſeen, (which the Papiſt I ſuppoſe ſay too) as to be wrought in us, or performed by Gods grace. But let me ask then, what they mean by this *Grace*? If they mean ſuch as is *effectual*, and determins the will, and ſo is *peculiar* to the Elect, Lo here the Doctrine of abſolute Election: If they mean ſuch only as leaves the *will* in *æquilibrio*, to be determined ſtill of it ſelf, then the matter returns to the former iſſue. I will therefore cloſe up this point of Election with the obſervation of that very judicious perſon that wrote the Councel of *Trent*, who having ſet down the debate of the Doctors about it, and divided them into two opinions, which comes in effect (without reciting the whole) to the tenents of *abſolute* and *conditional* Election, he gives us his judgment. *The firſt Opinion* (ſayes he) *which is* Auguſtines, *as it is myſtical and hidden, keeping the mind humble, and relying on God without any confidence*

fidence in it ſelf; knowing the deformity of Sin, and excellency of Divine Grace: So was the ſecond plauſible, and popular, cheriſhing Humane Preſumption, and making a great ſhew; and it pleaſed more the Preaching Fryers, than the Underſtanding Divines. The Defenders of this, uſing Humane reaſons, prevailed againſt the others: But coming to the Teſtimonies of Scripture, they were manifeſtly overcome. I deſcend not to the more minute Diſputations, *De prædeterminatione phyſica,* between the *Dominicans,* and *Franciſcans*; or *De ſcentia media,* among the *Jeſuits*, which are of lower date (I count) in the World, and ought not to make us trouble. I leave alſo the *Janſeniſt* and *Moliniſt* to that Bone; *Hæc prædeſtinatio Sanctorum nihil aliud eſt quam præſcientia ſcilicet, & præparatio beneficiorum Dei, quibus certiſſime liberantur quicunque liberantur. This Predeſtination of the Saints, is nothing elſe but the Fore-knowledge, and Preparation of thoſe Benefits of God, whereby they are moſt certainly ſaved, that are ſaved.* Aug. De bono, perſ. *c.* 14.

There are two Opinions yet I ſhall mention, which are ſingular; I do not think them true, yet am I pleaſed with any intent for compoſing the Scripture. The one is, that, aſcribed to *Catarinus* at *Trent*, to *Occam*, and others; That there are indeed ſome few Perſons, who are Elected *Abſolutely*; of theſe God takes a ſpecial care that they never fail; as we read of *Peter:* But that the reſt of Mankind are left to univerſal Grace, and the liberty of their wills, under a *Conditional* Election, and Reprobation. The other is an Opinion of a Learned Doctor of another Profeſſion, very Studious of the Holy Writings; who is often telling me when I ſee him, That, *Election is only to a Church-State, and peculiar Priviledges:* But that we read of a *Common Salvation.*

Of Redemption.

I Do not remember any thing in St. *Auguſtin* that is peculiar about this Doctrine: Only I take notice from ſeveral paſſages, that he goes ſtill the Narrow Way: That the Elect only are redeemed: That none but thoſe who are brought into the Church, by receiving all her Articles, and being Baptized, can be of that Number. That no Heathen, no Heretick, no Separatiſt from the Church, no Donatiſt, no Infant, though of Believing Parents, that dies unbaptized, can be ſaved. I muſt confeſs here I am not of the mind with this Father. And, as I apprehend, that *Juſtine Martyr*, and ſome ſuch Ancients, who were Philoſophers as well as Chriſtians, have ſpoken more nobly than thus: So do I think that he goes not here the way of the Scriptures. There is the *univerſal* Grace of God; and *ſpecial* Grace of God, I count, held forth therein: and both conſiſtent with one another. When Chriſt ſayes, He came to ſave the *World*, that The Father ſo loved the *World*, as to give his Son, That he *taſted Death for every Man*, and the like; let not any think, but the Grace of *Redemption* doth concern all the World: And when we yet maintain *ſpecial* Grace with this, let not any confine the ſame to this or that Sort or Sect of Religion, but let him judge rather, that the Elect are ſcattered throughout the Earth; and it is *God* alone *knows who are his*. There is the univerſal Grace of *Origen*, that all at laſt ſhall be ſaved, of *Pelagius*, of *Arminius*. There is alſo *gratia univerſalis æqualis & præcedanea*, of *John Camero*; we are not bound to maintain either of theſe: but there is *Gratia univerſalis ſimpliciter*, which if we maintain not, we muſt leave our Preaching, and the Goſpel. The Followers of Truth and Mediocrity will be afraid to hold any other *univerſal* Grace, but ſuch as I ſuppoſe St. *Ambroſe* holds in his Books *De vocatione Gentium*; that will agree well with the *ſpecial* Grace alſo and *Election* of St. *Auguſtine*; that is, ſuch only, I count, as may juſtly lay the blame

blame of mans Sin and his Deſtruction, altogether on himſelf, when it gives the whole Glory of his Salvation unto God. *They that obſerve lying vanityes, forſake their own mercy.*

For my proceeding on this point, it is not ſutable to my purpoſe to be critical upon any words in the original Languages that *Redemption* is expreſſed by: or, to pretend to curioſity in the Laws and Cuſtoms of the Jews or other natious about *Redemption* at large, which might be alluded to: I will rather leave this Note in my way, that, as the curious oftentimes are leaſt apt for plain things, ſo muſt I ſay, that whatſoever notion is offered upon this or any other head of Divinity by any, who perhaps are of more exquiſite learning and ſearch in ſome things than others are, if when they are ſufficiently declared, they are not apprehenſible by common and ordinary people as well as themſelves, I do account them little worth in the Chriſtian Religion. They were plain men who at firſt Preached the Goſpel, and they were plain men for whoſe ſake it was Preached, and is Written. When I ſee evidently that there muſt goe more skill to the finding ſuch or ſuch things out, more learning, ſubtil diſtinction, and wit, than, I beleeve, any of the Apoſtles if they were living ever had, I cannot but think preſently, There is none of Chriſts diſciples would have delivered this, and it matters not my ſalvation whether it be ſo or not.

Neither do I entend a *Common place* upon this, or other of the Heads which I treat on, but an *Exercitation* onely, in order to my particular deſign: you muſt not expect any more. There is one thing then I account here to be mainly of neceſſity or moment; and that is, the underſtanding our Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt but ſo, as that we may be ſolidly able to fix upon what that is which indeed accrewes to man from it, or which we may avouch for the *immediate* and uncontrolable fruit, or *benefit*, to us by it. I will not therefore make many words. The Redemption of man by Chriſt, I humbly conceive, does lye cheifly in this, The delivery of him from the *Law* as it was a *Covenant of works*, that is requiring of him ſuch conditions as he is not now in his *faln eſtate* ever able to perform; and ſo muſt inevitably periſh, if he were not delivered from it. *When the fulneſs of time was come* (ſayes the Apoſtle) *God ſent his Son, made under the Law.* &c. The

Law as given to the Jews was a *repreſentative* of the *Law of Nature* or *Covenant of Works*: and in Chriſts redeeming the *Jewes* from it as given by Moſes, he does redeem the *World* from that covenant which it repreſented, and there, I ſay, does lye the cheif point of our Redemption. That very thing then, or that great *immediate* effect or benefit which accrewes to man from Chriſts dying for him, is his having other terms procured upon which he may be juſtified and ſaved, than thoſe which by the Covenant of *nature* were due from him to obtain that end. *For, God ſo loved the World that he gave his onely begotten ſon that whoſoever beleeveth in him ſhould not periſh but have everlaſting life.* What is the *immediate end* here of God's giving his Son, That muſt be the *Immediate fruit* of Chriſts coming, dying, and redeeming the World. And what is that, but that *Whoſoever beleeveth in him, may not periſh?* That is, The delivery of him from the law of *Works*, and bringing him under the Covenant or law of *Faith*, that, upon the performance only hereof (who could not have it elſe without *perfect doing*) he may obtain everlaſting life. And whether this favour of Chriſts procuring new terms upon which man may be ſaved does belong to the Elect only, or to all the world, there will need no more but to ask, To whom the Goſpel is to be preached, to decide that queſtion.

It is true, that the freedom of the Jewes from the Moſaical law; the breaking down the partition-wall thereby for the Gentiles to be incorporated into one Church viſible; and a power in Chriſt himſelf to diſpenſe all aſſiſtances neceſſary to both for their obedience to the Goſpel; as alſo a diſcharge of mankind from damnation for Adams ſin onely, are fruits of Chriſts death, which may be ſaid too, immediate and univerſal: but the great benefit which indeed comprehends theſe and the like in it, and appeares ſo notorious in the whole New Teſtament, is, The reconciliation of the world unto God by his death or Redemption. And what elſe ſuch a reconciliation can eminently conſiſtin, but that I have named, I leave to the underſtanding to give judgment.

Neither are we to forget that our Redemption in Scripture is ſaid to be from *Sin*, and the *Devil*, as well as from the *Law*; for the one is the Foundation of the other. When man fell from God, the Devil obtained a right and dominion over him.

This

This was not a right as Lord, and Proprietour, but as Goaler and Executioner; that is, by vertue of that ſentence which the Law as the Covenant of works paſſed on him. When Chriſt then by his Satisfaction to the Juſtice of God, did put an end to that Covenant; this Right which the Devil held thereby, muſt ceaſe with it. In the Ceſſation of this Right; As the Slave who is redeemed from his ſlavery, is redeemed alſo from the work which he lives in as a Slave: So muſt all Mankind be redeemed from ſin; only this Redemption muſt be diſtinguiſhed, in regard of *Title*, and in regard of *Poſſeſſion*. It follows not becauſe *the World lies in Wickedneſs*, and *the Prince of the Air* ſtill *rules in the Children of Diſobedience*; that Chriſt hath not done His part in their Redemption: No, while the Law which held them under an impoſſible Duty (that is, the Law of Sin and Condemnation) is taken off, and the New Law is ſuch, as every one is capable to perform the Terms of it, if he will: It is not for want of *Right* to come out of this ſlavery; it is not for want of *Power*; but it is becauſe they are not willing to come out of it, becauſe they love their ſins; that the Devil keeps them ſtill in Poſſeſſion. Even as the *Hebrew* Servant, when the *Jubile* came; if he ſaid, he loved his Maſter, and would not go out free, he was to have his Ears boared to the Door-poſts of the Houſe, and remain his Slave for ever. There is a double work, therefore, Chriſt has to do as our Lord-Redeemer. The one is to procure Deliverance if we are willing; that is, our Redemption in regard of *Title*: And the other is, To make us *Willing*, which is, to put us alſo in Poſſeſſion. The one of theſe is that which is properly the work of our Redemption, and Univerſal: The other is peculiar to the Elect, and hath another name in Scripture; that is, our *Vocation*, *Effectual Calling*, or *Converſion*. Unleſs when this Poſſeſſion comes to be perfectly compleat, that is, at Death; and then it is again called the *Day of Redemption*. Whom he did *predeſtinate* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *them he alſo called*; *and whom he called, them he alſo juſtified*: *And whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified*. If Redemption were not of a larger extent than Election, Vocation, Juſtification, and Glory, then would the Apoſtle have ſaid; *Whom he did predeſtinate, he redeemed*: *And whom he redeemed, he called*.

But when we find no such Link in this Chain, it is a convincing Argument to my understanding, for the *Universalitie* of Redemption.

It is said of Christ, that he is the Saviour of the world; especially of his own body. In that Sentence we have both *universal* and *special* Grace together; and the one is Applicatory, not Destructive to the other. The *Redemption* of Christ is *universal*: The Grace whereby a Man savingly *believes*, and *repents*, and so becomes one of his Body, is *special*, and belongs to *Election*. The Death of Christ may be considered, as it redounds to the purchasing Remission of Sin and Salvation upon condition; or, as it redounds to the purchasing the Condition for Remission and Salvation. In the first sense, Christs Redemption and Grace of the Gospel is universal; Doctor *Twisse*, and the like Divines, will say twenty times over: In the second sense, they will have it for his Elect only. For my own part, I must go from them here, and account, That the work of Christs Redemption and whole Mediation upon Earth, does terminate in the former consideration. The business of a Mediatour between parties, does lie in this, To bring them to some New terms, wherein they may be agreed when they were at odds before. The business of Christs *Mediation, Redemption, Reconciliation, Propitiation, Satisfaction*; or whatsoever word out of Scripture, or Orthodox Writers is used, does lie, I account, in this altogether, That he hath taken that course with the Father, that he shall not deal with the world according to the Covenant of our Creation; which requires such terms, as no Man now thereby can be justified or saved; but according to the Covenant of Grace, which is such, that whosoever he be, that trusting in his Mercy and Goodness through Christ, does repent, and walk *sincerely* before him; though *imperfectly*, shall be Pardoned, Accepted, and Saved, and yet he be Righteous in so doing. This I say, is the *res ipsa*, (as I take it) *the thing it self*, intended in all these sorts of words, with the *connotations* only of the *modus* also, the *mode* or *qualification* thereof, according to such several Expressions.

Here then appears a Truth (as it seems at least) very agreeable to my Reason; and will be found as Consonant perhaps to the

the Judicious, with the Scripture; that the Merit, or Purchaſe of Chriſt's Death, or the Price he laid down for our Redemption, was not offered to the Father, to procure of Him, that he ſhould give Faith and Repentance to any; but that he ſhould give Remiſſion to thoſe that Repent, and Salvation to thoſe that believe on him. I humbly offer you theſe Reaſons:

1. The holding otherwiſe than thus, does make Chriſt's Redemption a *double thing*; one thing for one man, and another thing for another: It ſhall be procuring Salvation for *Judas*, if he repent; and it ſhall be the procuring Repentance for *Peter*, that he may be ſaved. 2. It goes quite againſt the hair to reaſon, that Chriſt ſhould procure the Benefit upon Condition, and only on Condition, and not otherwiſe; and yet that he ſhould procure alſo the Performance. To what purpoſe do we make ſuch a Labour about as this? Why do you not ſay, He purchaſed the Benefit rather free altogether without condition? 3. If our Believing, and Repenting, be alſo purchaſed, then is there nothing in Man's Salvation but of Purchaſe; and we ſhall be beholding to *Chriſt* for all, and to *God* for nothing. But if we are beholding to Chriſt for his Purchaſe, that Salvation may be had if we repent, and to God for this Repenting; then do we ſee, how highly Both are to be magnified for the Contrivance. 4. The Death and Redemption of Chriſt is for *All*, for *every man*; for *our ſins*, for the *world's*. Diſtinctions to anſwer this, are but Evaſions. But if Faith and Repentance be the purchaſe of Chriſts Death or Redemption, then cannot his Death and Redemption be univerſal, according to ſo many Scriptures. Let me double this, and add alſo, that the Purchaſe, or Redemption of Chriſt being univerſal certainly, as it is in Scripture, if by his Death he had procured the Condition, as well as the Covenant, and abatement of Terms, then muſt all Men Actually have been ſaved. I have one Reaſon yet more to offer; which is, That the want of knowing this, is, I take it, the great Stumbling-block, or Temptation to our Divines, in the receiving *univerſal* Grace, to caſt *ſpecial* Grace quite off; when they ſhould learn the true Mediocrity of reconciling both theſe together, according to the Scriptures.

When the *Arminian* then argues here, Chriſt hath died for

All,

All and Every man and that is not to be put off with the *generæ ſingulorum*, or, the Gentiles as well as the Jewes: therefore the grace of God is univerſal for all and every one to repent and beleeve that they may be ſaved. I anſwer, this is manifeſtly inconſequent, becauſe it is true that what Chriſt hath done by way of *Redemption* is univerſal, and belongs to all the World, and every man alike, which is terminated in procuring theſe terms to be offered to the World for ſalvation. But as for mans belief, repentance, ſincere obedience, which are the terms, they come *directly* and *immediately* otherwiſe, not from the grace of *Redemption*, nor from the fountain of mans *free will* with them, but from the grace of *Election*. God gives us his *Son*, and he gives us his *Spirit*. His ſending his Son is *one* thing, and his ſending his Spirit *another*. The work of *drawing* perſons *to Chriſt*, I do obſerve, is attributed to the *Father* and the *Spirit*, becauſe this is *Peculiar*: when the work which is attributed to Chriſt in diſtinction to them, is *Generall* to all mankind. He ſent his *Son* to purchaſe ſalvation, if we Beleeve: he ſends his *Spirit* to work that faith and repentance in us that we may be ſaved. In the one does lye the myſtery of our *Redemption*, in the other, I ſay, the myſtery of *Election*. Let it be true on one hand that Chriſt by his Redemption hath indeed procured no more for *Paul* and *Peter*, than for *Judas* and the reprobate, and ſo the honour of his *Redemption* be kept up with the *Arminian* to the height they contend for it: Yet may it be true, I hope likewiſe, on the other hand, that the grace of God towards *Peter* and *Paul* was more in giving them ſaving faith and repentance, than to *Judas* or the reprobate, and ſo the doctrine of *Speciall Grace* and *Election* need not neither be diſcarded.

For caution, There is the *Direct*, and *Collateral* iſſue (if I may ſo ſpeak) of Chriſts merit, purchaſe or death. It is certain that the Lord Jeſus may be ſaid by his death and merit to have procured his own exaltation, and as he is become thereby the Diſpenſatour of thoſe treaſures that are in his Fathers Eection, ſo repentance or faith in a collateral way may be accounted to iſſue from thence. *Whom God hath exalted* to be a *Prince* to give *repentance*, as well as be a *Saviour*, to procure *remiſſion to Iſrael*. But repentance, faith perſeverance, or the condition which God requires

requires of us, and not of Christ, in the buſineſs of our ſalvation, does not flow to us directly from, or is no direct and immediate fruit of, his *Death* or *Redemption*. I know moreover the Scripture tells us that we are *bleſſed with all ſpiritual bleſſings in him*: But that may be true I hope, though ſome of thoſe bleſſings only are the purchaſe of his *death*, and others the effect of his *Interceſſion*: or ſome the fruit of his *Purchaſing*, others the effect of his *Adminiſtring* of the new Covenant.

This is certain, the Spirit is the Authour of our faith, repentance, all grace: but the Spirit is obtained by vertue of Chriſts interceſſion. *I will pray the Father, and he will ſend the Comforter*. I offer you one argument. The Spirit proceeds not from the *Son* alone but from the *Father* and *Son*. The miſſion or giving of the Spirit therefore cannot be the effect of our *Redemption* which is peculiar to the Son, and belongs to all the World: but is the fruit or off ſpring of our *Election*. It is true, we come in the *name* of Chriſt to ask his Spirit, and grace, that is, we ask it through Chriſts *merits*: but there is the merits of his *Perſon*, as well as the merits of his *Death*; & it is one thing to be the *Propitiation for our ſins*, and another to be alſo our *Advocate with the Father*. This is that I will pitch upon, that we are not ſo to attribute all things to his *Oblation*, as to make any other part, or parts of his *Mediator-ſhip*, more then needs.

There is a diſtinction the Scripture makes of Chriſt in the *Fleſh* and in the *Spirit*. He was of the ſeed of David according to the the fleſh, and declared to be the ſon of God according to the Spirit, in his Reſurrection from the dead, and in his living ever to make interceſſion for us. What he did for man in the fleſh I account he did for all mankind, for he took not on him the fleſh of David onely and the elect, but of all man-kind, or of human nature: but what he does in the Spirit, that may be peculiar (in ſome points at leaſt) onely to his elect. Hence it is, that when he tells us he *Laid down his life for the World*, yet *I pray* ſayes he *not for the World, but for thoſe thou haſt given me out of the World*. The prayer of Chriſt is a part of his *interceſſion*, which is Diſtinct from his *oblation*, and it is no argument from his not *Praying* for the World, that therefore he *Died* not for it. *If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more*

shall your heavenly Father give his holy Spirit to them that ask him. God hath given his *Son* to those that never ask him, even to the whole *World:* but he gives the *Spirit* of the Son only to his *Children*, even to such as can cry *Abba Father*, when they have received it. *I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, even the Spirit of truth, whom the World cannot receive.* When he prayes not for the world, that he prayes for is the *Spirit*, and the Spirit which works grace in the heart whereby we are sanctified, and perseverance to bring us to glory, is peculiar to those whom God does *give to Christ*, and of whom Christ can say, *For they are thine, and all mine are thine, and thine are mine, and I am glorified in them.*

You may say, on the *one* hand, If it be no more which Christ hath purchased for *Peter* then for *all*, then *Peter* might perish for all Christs *Purhcase*. I answer, you may say so, and without ignominy to his *Redemption*, provided you know also that the *Election* of God and Christs *Prayer* will provided for *Peter* that further which it provides not for *all*, and Jesus Christ when he hath made his purchase, is the *Executor* of Gods *Election*. On the *other* hand it may be said, But to what purpose is this *Redemption universal* when none but those that perform the condition are saved? I answer, it is therefore *universal*, that none of those who performe the condition may *misse* of Salvation. As also, that though it be all one to *him* that does not perform the same, in regard of the event, as if he was not all Redeemed: Yet it is not all one as to *God*, and the *Verity* of Scripture, and his *Judgment* according to it. The Scripture sayes often, Christ *Dyed for All*; and that God will *Judge the World* according to *this Gospel*. He that *belives, shall be saved, he that believeth not, shall be damned*; the Foundation whereof is Christs Death, which must reach so far, as to make this good. And who knows not, that the very business of our whole Religion, does depend upon the Establishment of the Verity of the Holy Scriptures?

I must confess, I should most willingly hearken to any, that could make Christs Death more Advantagious; and when his purchase hath procured Faith and Repentance to no body, but Remission and Salvation to All, upon their Faith and Repentance,

tance, if they are willing to ſay, that there is ſufficient Grace alſo purchaſed for the *World*, that all, and every one ſhould Repent and Believe, and apply that Redemption; I am indifferent to the uſe of their Thoughts: But if when I rather grant a univerſal Power, ariſing from Chriſts purchaſe, not as a *direct fruite* of his Death, but as a *conſequential Event* (N. B.) from the Abatement only of the terms; that God is not wanting to any *in neceſſariis*, and conſequently, that all men have ſufficient *Light, Spirit, Grace,* or *Power,* to be ſaved, if they will: Yet ſo long as we cannot deny him, but he may abound *in gratuitis*, and to give the *Will* and *Deed* it ſelf, is more than to give *Power*, (as to have given to *Adam* the *Ipſum velle*, had been more, and a *gratuitum* wherein he might have abounded, if he had pleaſed, than in giving him only *Poſſe velle*) I cannot ſee by any means, but when Chriſts *Death* is made *univerſal*, the Fathers *Election* muſt be left ſtill, *Per modum decreti efficaciter operantis, By way of a decree effectually operating,* free and abſoute, in regard to the condition of it's Application. If all men have alike the *Poſſe velle, The Power to will,* and no more, then muſt the reaſon, Why one man Repents, and is Saved, and not another, be reſolved into his own ſelf only, and ſo may and muſt he ſay, it is I, I my ſelf have *made the difference,* when the Scripture does ſay, *Who is it, O man, that hath made thee to differ?* But if we allow (as *Redemption* to be *univerſal* ſo) a *Poſſe velle* from *general:* (I ſay, not a *Poſſe velle* as to the *Covenant* of our *Creation*, but as to the *Terms* of the *Goſpel*:) And to the Elect, the *Ipſum velle* from *ſpecial* Grace, we ſhall neither have any thing to *charge God*, nor give occaſion to *Mans boaſting*. Neither ſhall the condition be held *impoſſible*; nor when we have performed it, ſhall we rob God of his Glory.

It is pleaded, That unleſs Faith and Repentance does lie in every Man's own Breaſt, Chriſt's purchaſe of Pardon upon that Condition, is but a Mock. I anſwer, To deny that to Believe, and to Repent, does lye in our *Power*, were indeed, to evacuate Chriſt's Death to All, beſides the Elect: But to ſay, that Faith and Repentance therefore does flow from our own *Wills*, is another matter. I muſt offer moreover; If Chriſt had purchaſed Faith and Repentance for *ſome* which All have not, the

Reprobate might here have ſomething to ſay, That the Reaſon why he Repented not, as the Elect did, was, becauſe Chriſt purchaſed Repentance for the *One*, and not for the *Other*: But if Chriſt hath purchaſed nothing for *One*, but what he hath purchaſed for *All* (which *directly* is true,) then cannot the purchaſe of Chriſt be a Mock to any, ſeeing ſome do reap a real Benefit by it, and if others do not, it muſt be their Own fault. Indeed thoſe Divines, who confound the Bleſſings we have in Chriſt, ſo as to make them All alike the *direct* Fruits of his Death with no difference, muſt be under ſome manifeſt Prejudice here againſt St. *Auguſtine*, and his Doctrine. It ſtands not with reaſon, that any thing which is part of Chriſt's Purchaſe, ſhould be *peculiar*, for how then hath Chriſt dyed for *All*? That which is of *meer Favour*, is fit for the *Elect*; that which is of *Purchaſe*, ſhould be *univerſal*, or for All Mankind. If that Grace then, whereby we Believe and Repent, is a Fruit flowing from Chriſt's Death, no otherwiſe than the Covenant it ſelf does, theſe Divines alone muſt ſpeak agreeably, who will allow no other, but that which they call *ſufficient*, putting all men into an *equi libri-un*, or *equal Ballance*, between Chooſing and Refuſing, and ſo leaving it upon their own *Wills*, to *make the Difference*, Who are ſaved, and who are not ſaved? But to what little purpoſe ſuch *Grace* as this, is diſtinguiſhed at all from *Nature*, and into what inconveniences, eſpecially in reference to our Prayers, they muſt be lead that maintain it, I ſhall not be able to ſay preſently. *Cur admonemur orare pro inimicis noſtris vtique nolentibus pie vivere, niſi ut Deus in illis operetur & velle? Item cur admonemur petere ut accipiamus, niſi & ab illo fiat quod volumus, a quo factum eſt ut velimus.* Again, *Cur petitur quod ad noſtram pertinet poteſtatem, ſi Deus non adjuvat voluntatem? Why are we bid to Pray for our Enemies, whoſe Hearts we know are Averſe? Why are we bid to ask any thing which is in our own Power, but that it is God who turns the Will?* Auguſtine. Enchir: ad Laur. c. 31. Item De Gra. & alibi paſſim.

It is certain, that St. *Auſtine*, ſpeaking of what Grace *Adam* had, and what *We* have (*De correptione & Gratia*. c. 11.) does aſcribe the *Poſſe permanere ſi vellet, The power of ſtanding if he would* unto Grace. *Prima gratia quæ data eſt Adam, eſt qua fit*

ut

ut habeat homo juſtitiam ſi velit: Secunda ergo plus poteſt, quia etiam fit, ut velit. Again, *Poſſe permanere ſi vellet, quia dederat adjutorium per quod poſſet. He could have ſtood if he would, becauſe God vouchſafed help whereby he could.* I muſt confeſs, I ſhould have judged it not to be of *Grace*, that *Adam* had his *Poſſe perſeverare, his ſtrength to perſevere*, but of *Nature*, or his *Original Righteouſneſs*: And that *Grace* (which he calls *Adjutorium*) is proper to our falne Eſtate, for the *relieving* of Nature. But if it were of *Grace*, that *Adam* had the *poſſe* only, when he had not the *velle*, then may we aſſert *univerſal Grace* with the more Authority; while we ſay, that there is a *poſſe* now in Man falne, as to the performance of the *Covenant of Grace*, no leſs than in *Adam* at firſt, as to his keeping the *Covenant* of *Works*: when yet the *velle*, which is of *ſpecial Grace*, is not vouchſafed.

There may be here indeed, a moſt difficult Demand, and that muſt not be baulked; Whether the *Power*, which is *univerſal*, be of *Nature* or *Grace*? And I muſt profeſs, it is an Entanglement to my Thoughts, to diſtinguiſh *Nature* at all, from that *Grace* which is *univerſal*. Although for the ſake I ſuppoſe of ſome Texts, which attribute our *ſufficiency*, our *can*, our *power*, as well as our *will* and *deed* to God, when they ſay too it is not *of our ſelves*, Divines do it. There is that *Concourſe*, or *Operation* of God with Us, as reaches to the Endowing us with *Power*: or that which reaches to the Endowing us with the *Will*. The laſt of theſe only, if I might chooſe, I would have called *Grace*: Yet ſeeing Divines ſpeak otherwiſe, whether the former alſo, be called *Grace* or *Nature*, ſo long as it be held *univerſal*, I deſire to move no Contention. And you ſee me ſpeak as one indifferent in it.

If we conſult the *Schools*, we ſhall find them giving as little to the ſtrengh of nature as any others can doe. *Nullum initium juſtificationis poteſt fieri ſine gratia, Sive illud initium ſit cauſa, ſive meritum, condigni aut congrui, ſive impetratio, diſpoſitio, conditio ad quodlibet aliquid, quocunq; modo per ſe & ratione ſui, conducens ad juſtificationem. There is nothing that we can doe of our own ſtrengh without grace that is any cauſe, merit, diſpoſition, condition, or occaſion of our juſtification*, or the *beginning* of it. Ruiz.

De prædestinationis exordio. Trac. 3. Disp. 17. By justification they understand in effect regeneration, and they distinguish of an *occasion* which is *active* or *given of men*, and *passive* or *taken of God*. They will allow indeed that what we doe may be a *Passive* occasion or opportunity to God for the infusing his grace, which is with them to *justify* us, but no *Active*. *Illa occasiones per se, & ratione sui, nullam Physicam, nec moralem causalitatem exercent, ad obtinendam misericordiam Dei sed Deus pro sua intrinseca bonitate & Sapientia, ex illis occasionem accipit.* Jb. Dist. 16 Sec. 2. The sum is, that whatsoever man does by the strengh of nature, conduces to his effectuall conversion onely (as a *removens prohibens*) by *removing the hindrance* which otherwise we might put, if we with drew from the *means* that God hath appointed to obtain his grace. *Licet enim aliquis per motum liberi arbitrii divinam gratiam nec promereri nec acquirere possit: potest tamen seipsum impedire ne eam recipiat*, sayes *Aquinas*. *Though a man by the motion of his freewill cannot merit or procure the divine grace: yet can he hinder himself from receiving it.* They said unto God, Depart from us we desire not the knowledg of thy ways. *Quilibet actus qui a nobis eliciatur per vires naturæ sine auxilio gratiæ nihil ad gratiam justificantem, nec ad auxiliatricem gratiam influit: nihilue conducit aut confert per se ratione sui, sed selummodo quasi causa per accidens removendo prohibens, aut tanquam occasio & opportunitas passiua & a Deo accepta, non ab hominibus data.* Jb. Dist. 20.

Having gon thus far in abasing the strengh of nature, we shall find how they make it up again, with advancing an *universall Sufficient grace*, by the help of which lever the *free will* of man shall be lifted into the same throne, from whence before they threw it down. For when that grace which they set up, must be such only as gives a *next* power to beleeve and repent if we will, but leaves the will undetermined and uninclined, and this being Supposed to be vouchsafed to all according to the condition they are in, whether Elect or Reprobate alike, it is apparent that mans *free will* by the *cooperation* with this grace, or *refusal*, is that which begins, or puts by his own justification, and causequently *makes the difference* (in the upshot) between him that is saved, and him that is damned. *Supponimus omnibus adultis, nulla*

nullo excepto, dari auxilia ſufficientia ad ſalutem, & non impedita, ſed ita expedita, ut in poteſtate cujuſque ſit, illis cooperando, ulteriora auxilia obtinere, quamvis per vires naturæ non poſſint obtinere auxilia gratiæ. Again, *Barbari ignorantiſſimi per interiorem gratiam moventur ad cognoſcendum (non explicite ſed implicite & virtualiter, non certo ſed ſubdubio, non in particulari ſed in univerſali) aliquid ſupernaturale, atque ad illud deſiderandum: Idque ſufficit ut illuſtrationes & inſpirationes ſint quidditative ſupernaturales & ſufficientes ad juſtificationis initium.* *Idem ib Diſp.* 25. Now what my thoughts are of this, I have offered as I paſs; and more particularly, at the end, upon the firſt Head, of Election. There is *univerſal* Grace *conſiſtent* with the *Special* Grace of Gods Elect: Or *inconſiſtent* with it. The former, I ſhall like to have well explained. The latter, I take to be againſt St. *Auguſtine*, and the Scriptures. The Grace of God is *without*, or *within* us. There is the Love, or Good-will of God to Mankind, who *would have All to be ſaved:* Our Redemption by Chriſt; The remedyieg Covenant; The Goſpel. This is Grace *without*, and that ſome Grace there is then *ſufficient*, and *univerſal*, that yet hath no Effect on the moſt, is out of doubt. There is moreover, that Grace which lies in the Help, or Aſſiſtance of the Spirit *within*, and the Fruit of it, (*Gratia Auxiliatrix, & Infuſa*) and this our Divines doe diſtinguiſh into *Common* and *Saving*. By *Common*, they underſtand not the *univerſal ſufficient Aſſiſtance* of the Schools before, but ſome particular Operation of the Spirit, *Effecting* ſo much as it is given for, only becauſe thoſe *Effects* reach no farther than what is Common to the Elect and Reprobate, they call ſuch *Help* or *Grace* only *Common Grace*. Thus far we are ſafe; As for any Grace beſides all this, if there be any, not oppoſing Electing Grace, I ſhall be glad to hear it; but my own mind, I perceive, hangs thus. There is a Power to *will* or *nill*, to *act* or *not to act*, which is the power of Nature: And there is a *Diſpoſition* on the Will, being touched by the Holy Spirit, to the doing what is good. Between theſe two, *Nature*, and *Grace*, to advance a middle Power, ariſing from an Aſſiſtance *ſufficient*, preceding *Effectual*, that is to ſay, To make God by a *ſupernatural* Help, to produce a New Power,

which

which they call, a *next* Power, in every man, over and above that Power which we have by *Nature* (which is the *Remote* Power, though the Schools mean it not so, and which alone will render the Sinner inexcusable without any other) antecedent to the giving the *Will* and the *Deed*, wherein *effectual* Grace does lie: Even a New Power, I say, *Supernatural*, of Believing, Repenting, or Willing, besides the *Natural*, antecedent to Faith, Repentance, or the Will it self: I do not see to what purpose else, if it be not a Device under the Cover of that Name, to advance *Free-will*, and flap off St. *Augustine* (as I take it to be in the Schooles) it can be made to serve. What need is there of *Grace*, to put the Will only in *æquilibrio*, which it is in by *Nature*? If it *encines* not the *Will*, and carries the *Heart* and *Life*: What shall I say of it, but as of the *Wood* of the *Vine*? *Is it meet for any Work?* Yet if it be, I refuse not to hang my Vessel on it.

Auxilium, aliud est proxime & immediate sufficiens, quod videlicet formaliter & actualiter continet omnes causas, & conditiones, ex parte principii requisitas ad eliciendum actum quo immediate disponimur ad justificationem: Aliud vero non sufficit ad salutem nisi mediate atque remote, quatenus immediate sufficiens est ad eliciendum aliquem actum supernaturalem minus perfectum & remote distantem a justificatione; quem actum si peccator eliciat, de congruo merebitur, & impetrabit ulteriora auxilia supernaturalia, quibus possit elicere Perfectiores actus, proximius disponentes ad justificationem, quousque ipsam obtineat. Ruiz. De præcip. effec. benevol. Dei erga reprob. Sec. 2. *Auxilium vel immediate vel mediate sufficiens, omnibus adultis, quamdiu sunt viatores, tribuitur ad omnes actiones quæ sunt ad salutem simpliciter necessariæ.* Ib. Sec. 3. *Auxilium remotum simpliciter necessarium cujus virtute fit absolute possibile proximum Auxilium obtinere, nunquam subtrahitur, etiam propter gravissimas culpas.* De prin. imped. justif. Sec. 5. I present this to the Reader only for Light, out of courtesie, that he who would without more pains, may yet see, how the Schools order their Matters. And the truth is, if they would *order* it but a *little* otherwise, without it's Antecedency and Equality, This *sufficient universal Grace* of theirs might do well. There is an Equality in regard of *Quantity*, which

which no body will contend for: Or in regard of *Principle*. *Ratione principii in actu primo causantis Operationem.* The concourse of God, as the first cause, with Nature in all her Acts, and so with Mans Free-will, is one *principle of Operation*: And that Assistance which we call *Grace*, is another. Of *Grace* likewise, the Assistance which is *Common*, and which is *Effectual*, are two *Principles* according to us. If we shall therefore make the Assistance of God, which belongs to *all*, to be *equal*, we destroy *special* Grace: But if we seperate this Equality from the *Universality*, and tye not an Antecedency to the *sufficiency* (for what hinders, but God may work *effectually* on some Persons altogether graceless at once?) I see no hurt in the *Maintenance* of it, if I were first convinced of a *necessity* for it.

From hence there is a Point of another sort, that is, of Practical Divinity comes in upon us: To wit, How far a Natural Man may go, and yet fall short of True Grace, and Salvation? To answer which, we are to know, that it is one thing to ask what a Natural man *can do?* And another, What he may do, and yet be an Unregenerate Man? The first Question, is the Controversal Point in hand, between Us and the *Arminians:* And I say, it is agreeable to that *Righteousness of God*, which is Revealed in the Gospel, and to Common Reason, that when Christ dyed to Redeem the World from the Law of Works, because through the Weakness of the Flesh, it was impossible for us to perform the same; the New Terms which he hath procured for us in the Remedying Law, should be so Adapted to our False Estate, as to be made no less possible to us, or within our Power now, than the Terms of the Covenant of Nature, was to *Adam* in the state of Innocency. There is no Interpretation of any Scripture, must be admitted against universal Reason, and the goodness of God. For the second Question: Take a Drunkard, or the like Sinner, I say, this man can, and may presently resolve to keep his ill Company no more; he may command his outward Man, and so his leggs to carry him from the Ale-house, if he will. If he does thus, he leaves that sin, so may he others. He may Hear, Pray, set up Duty in his Family: He may *Receive the Word*, which is more, and bring forth *Fruit*,

with this difference only, that the Regenerate man, does it with an *honeſt Heart*, which he hath not. There is the *matter* of our Duty, and the *manner* of *Performance*. This Queſtion which ſeems ſo difficult, perhaps to many, is eaſily determined. The Unregenerate Man *can* do if he will, and may *will*, and *do*, that, and all that which the Regenerate man does, in the *matter*: but as for the *manner*, this is certain, that the Regenerate man, only does act out of that *Principle*, and to that *End*, and with thoſe *Circumſtances* (particularly, in regard to the Predominancy of Gods Intereſt, over the Fleſh and the World) as brings up what he does, to anſwer the Covenant Terms, and ſo alone is entituled to the promiſed Reward, which is to be juſtified and ſaved. In concluſion, we ſee how the Miſtery of Election ſhews it ſelf; when there is no man but *can*, if he will, and yet there is no man ever *will*, as he ought, without this *ſpecial* Grace of the Elect; What ſhall we ſay, but, *Great is the myſtery of Godlineſs*! It is *he hath wrought us for this ſelf ſame thing*; Bleſſed be the God of Grace!

And here are there ſome *Socinian*, as well as *Arminian* Diſputes might be Touched, under this Head of Chriſt's *Redemption*, eſpecially in relation to his *Satisfaction*. For it may be, that ſuch a leſs intricate Conception only of what we are to underſtand by Chriſt's *Satisfaction*, might bring the moſt of ſeveral Parties to Agreement. It is a Queſtion, Whether God could pardon a Sinner without Satisfaction? And conſequently, Whether there be any neceſſity of Chriſt's Dying to that purpoſe? I anſwer, There is no Mortal, upon the Terms of the Covenant of our Creation, can be juſtified. (Hence is it (*N. B.*) that by *Nature*, we are all ſaid to be the *Children of Wrath*,) It is neceſſary therefore, theſe Terms be altered. This is that which Jeſus Chriſt hath procured for Us by His *Redemption*, by the *Merits* of his *Life* and *Death*, by his *Satisfaction*; that is, ſuch a well-pleaſing of the Father, in the whole courſe of his Life and Death, that for his ſake, he *might* (without any Diſhonour to him, or to his Law, as Rector) and *does* condeſcend to do it: And there ſhould be an end, if I might over-rule the more Intelligent, of ſuch, and the like kind of Queſtions.

Deo Gloria, mihi Condonatio. J. H.

An Advertiſement.

THis Paper *Of Election and Redemption*, ſhould have preceded the former *Of Juſtification* the Term before. The next in order, *Of the Law and the Goſpel, and the Covenants of both*, will follow (if prudence direct) the Term enſuing. Sold, and to be Sold by the ſame Booksellers. *T. P.*

THE
Middle-Way

In One Paper of

JUSTIFICATION.

With indifferency between

PROTESTANT & PAPIST.

By J. H.

Doing nothing by Partiality.

LONDON,

Printed for T. Parkhurst, at the Three Bibles in *Cheap-side*. 1672.

Of *Juſtification.*

IT is a trouble to to me often, in reading Polemical Divinity, to ſee how men that *walk in a vain ſhew* to others, and *diſquiet themſelves in vain*, are governed by *Prejudice* and *Party*: it is a hard thing many times, and a man muſt be very witty, and ſtrain himſelf to pick a fault in his Adverſary, *for matter of contention*; when a little pains only to underſtand him, and the leaſt candour, or, but a bare equality, in the interpretation, would bring him whether he would or no, almoſt, to *reconciliation*. The truth is, the Papiſts do abuſe the Proteſtants, and the Proteſtants abuſe the Papiſts, and that is the ſumme of moſt of our great Controverſies. I judge the like between Arminian and Calviniſts, and other Contenders. If *Luther* hath ſaid it, or *Calvin* hath ſaid it, it muſt be *Heretical*: and if the Council of *Trent* have delivered it, or *Bellarmine* ſaid ſo, it muſt be *dangerous*, it ſavours of the *Harlot*, it is the *abominable doctrine of the Church of Rome*. Amongſt the many conteſts between this Church and us, there are few which are carryed on with that affection and concernment, as the diſpute of Juſtification. St. *Paul* was the firſt that engaged upon this point, and not without ſome warmth againſt thoſe that oppoſed him. S. *James* is the next that hath ſpoken of this Subject. The Primitive Church and the Fathers after them have accorded pretty well with both; but the School-men as I take it, by preſſing ſome paſſages of the Fathers over-cloſely, having obſcured the *grace*

of the Gospel, our Protestant Churches have risen up as it were under the *standard* of St. *Paul*, that is *under his words*, and the Roman Church under the words of St. *James*, and come out into a set Battel, which serving only to raise up *dust*, *darkness* and *doubt* among the most, it is a *conference* I count between the *Leaders*, I mean a plain understanding or adjustment only of the *one* united certain sense of *both Apostles*, inspired by the same holy Spirit, that will, that must, and does give light to the intelligent and impartial, to uncloud the errors on each side, and end the quarrel.

The word *justify* is from the word *just*, and one may be said to be made or rendred just, by *infusion*, or by *plea*. Our Protestant Divines do all teach us that the word is a forensical term, and is to be understood in opposition to *condemnation*, for which they have good Scripture: the Papists doe tell us, that to justify a sinner, is to make him righteous, and understand by it, in effect, the same thing with *sanctification*. St. *Augustine* it must be acknowledged hath lead them this way. Gratificavit nos in dilecto, gratificavit a gratia, sicut justificavit a justitia. *De bono perseverantiæ*, c. 6. Christus justificat impium faciendo ex impio Christianum. *Christ does justify the ungodly, by making him of one that is wicked, a holy man, or a Christian*, Contra litteras *Petiliani* l. 3. c. 45. There is his book *De spiritu & littera*, where he hath the same up, and from whence a man may pick out his judgment on this point rather then any where else that I know. I did expect to find more, *De fide & operibus*, but I perceive it does mainly respect another matter: we may see also his Book, *De libero arbitrio & gratia*. The judgment then of this Father which leads the Schools in their disputes about these matters, as to the main, comes to this. That God of his own goodness only, or free will, to wit, according to Election, does vouchsafe the holy Spirit to some Persons, who does infuse his grace in their hearts; which grace is that which disposes them to all righteousness, and is the same according to him, otherwhere with Charity, which fulfils the law, and so justifies us. And in this sense does he tell us, that, Bona opera sequuntur justificatum, non præcedunt justificandum; that is, *Good works do follow the Person justified, and do not go before justification.*

cation. The meaning whereof with him is, that we muſt firſt have this grace infuſed (which habitually enclines to our whole duty both unto God and to our Neighbour), that is, the making the ungodly a juſt man, before he can do any thing that is good. *Pelagius* doctrine was, that grace is given according to our merits: but St. *Auguſtines* doctrine is, that grace is firſt given, and good works follow.

When the Apoſtle then does tell us that we are juſtified by *grace*, this Father I ſay underſtands by it this infuſed grace, that is, an habit of righteouſneſs infuſed into the heart, for fulfilling the law of God, and ſo juſtifies. Lex data eſt ut quæreretur gratia, gratia data eſt, ut lex impleretur. *The law is given that grace may be ſought, and grace is given that the law may be fulfilled.* De ſpir. & lit. c. 19. In correſpondence to this, when the Apoſtle ſayes we are *juſtified by faith*, he tells us, that it is by its *impetration of this grace*. Impetrat orando, he has it in another place. Faith carries us to God, when we cannot fulfill his commandements our ſelves, and by the infuſion of this habit he enables us to do it, and thereby are we juſtified in his Opinion. Quod operam lex minando imperat, hoc fidei lex credendo impetrat. Lege operum dicit Deus fac quod jubeo: lege fidei dicitur Deo da quod jubes. *That which the law of works requires by threats, the law of faith obtains by believing. In the law of works, God ſaies, doe what I command: in the law of faith, we ſay to God, give what thou commandeſt.* Ib. c. 12. Opus quod qui fecerit vivet in eo, non fit niſi juſtificato: juſtificatio autem ex fide impetratur. *The works which he that does ſhall live in them, are not done but by the juſtified: and juſtification is impetrated by faith.* c. 19. Lex non evacuatur ſed ſtatuitur per fidem, quia fides impetrat gratiam qua lex impleatur. *The law is not made void, but eſtabliſhed by faith, becauſe faith fetches from God his grace whereby the law is fulfilled.* c. 30. Now when he accounts that this grace which makes us juſt, or this infuſed grace is obtained by faith it is plain, that he muſt account that good works do follow it. Upon which there is a difficulty might be propoſed to this Father, the ſpirit infuſes this grace: does faith then precede the ſpirit that infuſes it, or not? If it doe, then muſt our faith be of our ſelves, when our good works

are

are of his gift. And this indeed was his judgement, while he wrote this book, though after he recalled it in others. See particularly *De gra. & lib. arb. c.* 5. Where he is proving that our converſion, and ſo faith it ſelf is from God.

To go on, when the Apoſtle does oppoſe this *faith* and *grace* unto *works*, he is put to it: for, when by *grace* he underſtands nothing but infuſed righteouſneſs for the fulfilling the law, how does that oppoſe *works?* For the making his notion hold therefore, by works in oppoſition to grace and faith he underſtands Opera ſine adjutorio & dono Dei, *works without the aſſiſtance and gift of God.* In ſhort, our juſtification is not of works, which are done before we have grace: but of works which proceed from it. Iſrael non pervenit ad juſtitiam, quare? quia non ex fide ſed tanquam ex operibus: id eſt, tanquam eam per ſemet ipſos operantes, non in ſe credentes operari Deum. *Iſrael attained not to righteouſneſs, why? becauſe he ſought it not of faith, but as it were of works: that is, as working it out of themſelves, and not believing in God to work it in them.* Ib. c. 19. So De gra. & lib. arb. c. 8. Quomodo non ex operibus ne fortè quis extollatur! audi & intellige, non ex operibus dictum tanquam tuis ex te ipſo tibi exiſtentibus, ſed tanquam his in quibus te Deus finxit. Ipſius enim figmentum ſumus creati in Chriſto Jeſu in operibus bonis. *How, not of works that one may not boaſt? hear and underſtand, it is ſaid not of works as thy own done by thee of thy ſelf: but of thoſe as in which thou art created by God, for we are his workmanſhip created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works.* Again, Ignorantes Dei juſtitiam, id eſt, quæ ex Deo eſt homini ut ſit juſtus: & ſuam volentes conſtituere, tanquam per eorum non adjutam divinitus arbitrium lex poſſit impleri. *Being ignorant of the righteouſneſs of God, that is, which comes from God to man, to make him righteous: and being willing to eſtabliſh their own, that is, as if by their own free-will without the divine help, they were able to perform the law.* Contra duas Epiſtolas Pelagianorum. l. 3 c. 1.

In this doctrine of the Father, there are three things wherein he is out.

The firſt is in his conception of *grace.* When *works* and *grace* are oppoſed we are not to apprehend with him, that grace is taken

taken for any thing infuſed in the Soul, which is inherent grace: for *works* and *grace* in this ſenſe have no oppoſition, the one being the fruits of the other. But by grace, we muſt underſtand the grace of God without us, the grace which is in God, that is, his favour or the condeſcention of God to us in this matter. And thus is the oppoſition very plain. That which is of *debt* is one thing, and that which is of *favour* another. *Not of works*, that is, not of debt, or of what would make the reward to be due: *but of grace*, that is, when it is not due, but of favour. The certain truth is this, God Almighty gave to man a law according to his nature, which he repeated to the Jews, and if any man were able to keep this law according to the Covenant of Nature, then ſhould his juſtification be of *right* and *due*, according to the law of his creation: but the Apoſtle does moſt induſtriouſly prove, that neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* was able to produce theſe *works*, and conſequently if there be any, whether *Jew* or *Gentile* that are juſtified, it muſt be by *grace*, becauſe it cannot be of *right*, or what he may challenge by the law upon that account. Grace then, and mark it well, is the accepting of any mans perſon, or thing which is done, when one may chooſe, or when in juſtice one were not bound to do it. Accordingly, when God juſtifies us by grace, it is his accepting of us as righteous, or of what we doe, for righteouſneſs, and rewarding it as ſuch, when according to his law it would not *ſtand*, but he might condemn us for it. Let any who have better words uſe them, I regard only my ſenſe. And here may we have an anſwer to a queſtion of great heat amongſt our Divines. The Goſpel requires Faith, Repentance, and new Obedience, and how then are we juſtified and ſaved by *grace*, or how then is grace *free*, when it is not vouchſafed but upon *conditions*? This difficulty hath made ſome run into that extream, that the Covenant of grace is without condition: but I ſay readily, the grace of God, or of the Goſpel is *free*, in that he accepts of the ſinners faith and repentance, when he needs not, or when according to the *law*, he is not tyed to it, unleſs mans obedience were perfect. That which our Divines do offer uſually is this: It is free becauſe it is not of merit, mans belief and obedience cannot merit any thing at the hands of God, and much leſs ſalvation, as well from

the

the disproportion of our performances, or momentary sufferings, to the eternal weight of glory, with other the like reasons, as that we do herein but our duty, and he helps us also in the doing, which are the cheif reasons that are urged. This information does labour I think with some defect of light. If man had performed the condition of the Covenant of works, it might upon these reasons have been said, that life and salvation, had been still of *grace* and *free*, as not merited, while these considerations hinder merit: whereas the Apostle industriously opposing the sinners being justified, or saved freely by Gods grace, to justification by works, or the deeds of the law, does account, if man were justifyed by *works*, it would be of *debt*. Could a man (I say) have performed the condition of the Covenant of Nature, the Apostle accounts still in his reckoning that then had the reward been of *debt* or *merit*, and if a mans own Conscience could not accuse him of sin, he had no need of *grace*: but now sayes he, seeing both *Jew* and *Gentile* fall short hereof, and all are become guilty before God, there is none is, or can be justified, but it must be *gratis*, *freely* in opposition to that performance. To lend more help against this difficulty we must distinguish of merit. There is a debt or merit of *commutative* justice, or of governing *distributive* justice. It is impossible that any should engage the Almighty in a debt of the former sort. Of the latter sort, there is a debt or merit upon *compact*, or upon *strict retaliation*. It is true, that there is nothing man does, or could do in the state of innocency, had he continued perfect, can merit, or could have merited any reward from God, upon the score of a strict retaliation, or returning good for good, any more then upon commutative justice, because there is nothing we can do to our Governour, who is infinite, to *benefit*, or *hurt* him: and so these reasons before named of our Divines and others, may come in if they please. *Can a man bee profitable to God*, sayes *Eliphas* to *Job*. And, *who hath given to the Lord that he should receive of him* sayes the Apostle. But the case is not so (under their favour) with a debt, or merit upon *compact*. A compact then may be twofold. Upon terms that are *equal*: and upon terms *unequal*. In a compact upon terms that are equal we are to know that the reward does become debt, or may be said to be of merit, notwithstanding by way of strict retaliation,

tion, or upon an account of equal benefit, the performance of the condition would require no ſuch matter. For inſtance, if I agree to give a man half a crown for his dayes work, I muſt pay it him as *debt*, though the emolument to me by the work done, is not worth it, nay, though if I had not agreed, I ſhould have thought much to give him half the money: but in a compact upon terms *unequal*, as if I promiſe a poor man a ſhilling for his leading my horſe to the next ſtile, though I am bound to give it to him when he has done ſo, yet is the ſhilling an *Almes*, or the reward of *grace*, (or favour) for all that. Now I account when God in the Covenant of Nature, hath made eternal life to be due upon exact obedience, it is a compact upon terms but *equal*, he that *doth them, ſhall live in them*. So long as man was innocent, God in juſtice could not puniſh him: and ſo long as he continued but in the ſame ſtate he was created, he muſt be happy, and eternally ſo, which is the ſame thing with *ſalvation*, only it could not be called by that name, till man was firſt *loſt*. Neither may Gods giving him ability, or his doing no more then his duty, be any hindrance to him of meriting upon this compact, any more then my letting the man I have hired, to work with my ſhovel or mattock, and his doing only what he was bid, hinder him of his wages: the reaſon is, becauſe the compact ſuppoſes that if he does but his duty, with the ſtrength that God has given, or does give him, he ſhall be juſtified and bleſſed. If *Adam* then had, or we could perform the condition of *Nature*, which is to live perfectly without offending God at all, the reward no doubt (ſeeing the Apoſtle ſo accounts of it) ſhould be of *merit* or *debt*, for that was a Covenant upon terms but *equal*, it being *meet* that God ſhould deal benignly with us as his *Creatures*, while we carry our ſelves towards him as our *Maker*, and that he ſhould not deprive us of any benefit, to which we were *created*, before we forfeited it by our tranſgreſſion. But now when he gives us the reward, which is *eternal life through his Son*, upon an obedience which is imperfect (that is by a new Covenant upon terms *unequal*) he gives it *freely*, ſeeing he gives it without performance of the condition at firſt required to obtain the ſame. The ſum of this is, *the rectoral* juſtice of God is either under the *ſtrict* law, or un-

der the *law of grace*. When our Divines then say that our works do not merit, they say true, but they must be rightly understood: when they give us those reasons for it, at first named, their reasons are good against all merit of *commutative* justice, and of strict retaliation in *distributive* justice, and against merit *ex pacto* under the *strict law*, or upon terms that are equal: but as to a merit of compact under the law of grace, *secundum regimen gratiæ paternum*, they are not good. When by some of these reasons therefore, our works, if they were perfect, should not yet be meritorious, which is a contradiction to the Apostle, I must conclude that the reason why grace is said to be *free* by St *Paul*, is not because our works do not merit upon their reasons, or do not merit with a merit of strict retaliation, or, *ex pacto*, upon terms that are equal, which their reasons only exclude: but because we do not come up to those (those works), which notwithstanding their reasons, would merit if we did perform them; that is, because they come short of that condition, which by Gods first compact according to *nature*, should make the reward to be of debt, and yet God accepts of them for Christs sake, and rewards them no less then if they did. That the grace of justification is purchased by Christ, it is apparent in the words that are ordinarily joynd with it, *Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*. But if the notion of *free* did lye in the conception, our Divines ordinarily frame, then could it not be the fruit of Christs purchase, for how can that which is *purchased*, in their sense be *free*? whereas it is this grace certainly, is the main fruit of Christs redemption; to wit, that the new Covenant should be established, so as the poor sinner whose Conscience does condemn him of the breach of that law, which is *written in his heart*, and according to which he should dye, hath yet a refuge to Gods mercy, which he is said, (I pray pardon me the repetition) to bestow *freely*, because man hath not the works which should make the reward due to him. Lo then how the grace of God is said *free* indeed in the meaning of the Apostle. Not upon the account, I say that man *cannot merit at Gods hand*, (though it be true that *our works do not merit*) as our Divines ordinarily only inform us, seeing both that God can be made debtor,

debtor *ex pacto*, *regimine gratiæ paterno*, and Christ who became man did merit for us: but upon the account here mentioned; which is a most direct answer to the doubt proposed, how the grace of God can be free, which is not tendred and obtained but upon condition; and I declare that Gods abatement of the terms, and requiring a *new* condition is that which therefore makes it free, seeing it is tendred and obtained without performance of the *old*. As also that the new being *unequal*, hinders not *grace*.

The second thing wherein St. *Austin* is out, is in his interpretation of *Works*. It is manifest that *Paul* speaks of works in such a sense, as no man living can perform them, and upon that account no man can be justified by them. But if the interpretation of this Father, and the Papists after him were true, that by works we must understand works only that are done before a man is regenerate, or before he hath the help of the spirit, then may a man who is regenerate, and hath its help, perform the works that the Apostle speaks of, and so be justified by them. And then must his doctrine be false that comes to this universal conclusion. *Wherefore we conclude that by the works of the law shall no flesh living be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledg of sin.* On the other side, when some Protestants conceive that the Apostle speaks of our works in general, and accounts that we are not justified by *them*, because it is by the *righteousness of Christ* that we are justified, I cannot but think they are out likewise. For if when *Paul* sayes we are not justified by *works*, his meaning were, not by our *own works*, but by the *obedience of Christ* wrought for us: then when *James* sayes we are justified by *works*, his meaning must be by the *works Christ did for us*, and he must not mean our *own*. But this is absonant to any rational apprehension to construe St. *James* so. Nor do I think such a meaning ever came into the heads of either of the Apostles. Our Divines then should not say here of our works in general, but as to the sense the Apostle speaks of them in general, we are not justified by them. And what is that sense then in which he speak of *works*? why he speaks of works in that sense most manifestly as the *law* require them, *that we may live in them*. Let a man then have the help of the spirit, or be

By

without it, ſo long as he falls ſhort of what the law requires at his hands, be it never ſo little, he cannot *live* by thoſe works; the curſe is due to him for the leaſt breach, and that is contrary to juſtification. There are ſome Divines of note therefore, ſeeing no footing for this diſtinction, have choſe an other. There are works of the *Law* (ſay they:) and works of the *Goſpel*. When St. *Paul* ſayes we are not juſtified by *works*, he ſpeaks expreſly of *works of the Law*: St. *James* is to be underſtood of the *works of the Goſpel*. This diſtinction may ſerve well, provided it be cloathed with the ſenſe of the Apoſtles. When ſome have uſed theſe terms to ſignify no more but that we are not juſtifyed by Jewiſh obſervations, but by the righteouſneſs of the Goſpel, it falls too ſhort in the firſt branch to do any thing. But by the *works of the law* let them underſtand *works which anſwer the law*, and that there are none juſtified by the *works of the law*, becauſe there is none perfectly fulfil it, and they have hit the buſineſs. For though *Paul* ſpeaks not only of works by the law of innocency, but directly and moſtly of the works of the Jewiſh law, which the Jews fancied, *ex ſufficientia & præſtantia legis*, did as ſuch, procure pardon and life, without looking to the merits of the Mediator for it, and ſo erred: yet the law of *Moſes* conſiſting either in *moral* precepts that repreſented the law of Nature which no man can come up to, and the moſt righteous of them did break: or in the *remedying* commandements of ſacrifices or attonements for ſin, whoſe virtue alone did lye in the blood of the Redeemer: the ground and bottom of their errour which he confuteth does indeed lye herein, that whatſoever it was they did, or whatſoever they thought of it, it did fall ſhort of the law of works, therefore did not juſtify them before God. There are works then which if they be performed doe *anſwer the law*, the law we are to mean ultimately as given to mankind in a Covenant by our creation: and works which if performed do *not anſwer the law*, but anſwer the Goſpel. If the diſtinction before-cited be received with this meaning, it is true that *Paul* ſpeaks of the works of the *law*, and *James* of the works of the *Goſpel*; and that there is no man juſtified by the *former*, becauſe there is no man does or can perform them, when we do perform the *latter* and are juſtified by

by them. To give more light and weight to this. There are works which if we be juſtified by them exclude grace: and there are works which exclude not grace though we be juſtified by them. The works of the law, take them in this ſenſe, that anſwer the law if they be performed, muſt make juſtification due ſo as it may be challenged according to the law; the reward ſhall be of debt, and there be no need of grace but juſtice in the caſe, for he that doth them ought of right to live in them. And theſe are the works undoubtedly that *Paul* diſputes againſt, while he proves juſtification to be of grace; which is alſo agreeable to the end and ſcope the holy Ghoſt ſeems to have in it, to wit, the beating man down from all vain exaltation in himſelf, and laying him at Gods feet for all he has. Wherein it were not yet enough that what he hath is received, ſeeing he would be even ready to boaſt of this, that he hath received what others have not: but that when he is enabled by God to perform that which he does, even this which he hath received, and is accepted, is but ſuch as God Almighty might chooſe whether he would accept it or not, and if it were not for *grace*, for all he hath done, he could not yet be juſtified and ſaved. On the contrary hand therefore, the works of the Goſpel, that is the works which the Goſpel requires of us as the condition of our juſtification and ſalvation, ſuch as faith, repentance, and new obedience, when they are performed, and anſwer the *Goſpel*, they do yet ſtand in need of grace, becauſe they do not anſwer the *law*, and God might chuſe whether he would accept them or no, or make any promiſe to them. When we repent it includes the acknowledgment of ſin, and when we believe, it is a flying to Gods mercy for it, and though we may walk *ſincerely* before God, we do not, and cannot walk *perfectly*, and he might condemn us in juſtice for the leaſt failings, and much more for our manifold tranſgreſſions. If God then ſhews mercy, and accepts of what we do, it muſt be of his grace that he does it. It is true that theſe works do juſtifie us, but that is while we are judged at the bar of Gods grace, or according to the new Covenant, which is therefore called a Covenant of grace, or the law of grace, becauſe that grace is no wayes deſtroyed, but confirmed by theſe works. From whence it may appear that the two A-

poſtles

poſtles ſhall be ſo far from contradicting one another about this point, as that what St. *Paul* contends for, ſhall be made good by that which is ſaid by St. *James*. *Paul* ſayes we are juſtified by grace, and St *James* proves it, while he ſhews us that our works which are *imperfect* (even ſuch as *Rahabs* as well as *Abrahams*) are accepted and rewarded as if they were *perfect*, that is, are imputed to us for righteouſneſs, which they could never be but for *grace*, and that purchaſed through the redemption which is in Chriſt Jeſus.

The third thing wherein St. *Auguſtine* miſtakes, is that which ſtrewes the way to the Papiſts doctrine of juſtification by *works*: and therefore it will be neceſſary before I come to it, to advance here ſomthing out of this Father which offers us I think ſome light towards the fixing our own doctrine of juſtification by *faith*. *Per legem cognitio peccati: per fidem impetratio gratiæ contra peccatum: per gratiam ſanatio animi a vitio peccati: per animi ſanitatem libertas arbitrii: per liberum arbitrium juſtitiæ dilectio: per juſtitiæ dilectionem legis impletio.* De ſpir. & lit. c. 30. *By the law we have the knowledg of ſin: by faith we impetrate Gods grace againſt ſin: by grace the ſoul is healed from corruption: by that healing we have liberty of will: by this liberty we come to love righteouſneſs: by the love of righteouſneſs we perform or fulfil the law, and ſo are juſtified.* Faith then does juſtifie according to him, as *exordium hujus ad ſalutem connexionis* (ſo he expreſſes it c. 31.), as *the beginning work that brings on the reſt which follow in this connexion*, or as the foundation link in this chain of our ſalvation. That we may be ſure of his judgment herein this muſt not go without ſome quotation, from one of his latter books alſo. *Ex fide autem ideo dicit juſtificari hominem, non ex operibus, quia ipſa prima datur, ex qua impetrentur cætera, quæ proprie opera nuncupantur, in quibus juſte vivitur. The Apoſtle ſaith a man is juſtified by faith and not by works, becauſe it is faith that is firſt given, from whence they follow, or by which the grace of God to lead a holy life is obtained. De prædeſtinatione ſanctorum. l. 1. c. 7.* And unto this will I add the ſuffrage yet of a greater Authour, the Son of *Sirach*, *Faith is the beginning of cleaving to God.*

There may be here therefore two queſtions, *de fide*. *Quæ juſti-*

juſtificat, and *quâ juſtificat*. What faith it is that juſtifies us? and, how faith juſtifies us?

For the former it is agreed eaſily. That faith which *worketh by love*, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks, or that faith which is *made perfect by works* as St. *James* ſpeaks, and no other is that which juſtifies us. There are ſome Divines make faith a complex thing to comprehend repentance and obedience under it. Faith, ſay they, is the receiving Chriſt both as Saviour and Lord, or the receiving him upon the terms of the Goſpel: and it is no wonder if they ſay faith alone juſtifies us, when this faith alone is no leſs with them then the whole condition which the Goſpel requires of us to our juſtification. Others do diſtinguiſh *faith*, *repentance*, and *obedience*, and ſay, that it is not *faith* alone, but *repentance* and *new obedience* alſo is required to juſtifie us. And both theſe ſorts of Divines ſay but the ſame thing in effect, and agree in their meaning. When the Scripture therefore ſayes, *If thou believeſt thou ſhalt be ſaved, or if thou repenteſt thou ſhalt be ſaved*, *Bellarmine* ſayes ſuch Texts muſt be underſtood with the ſuppoſition *ſi cætera adhibeantur*, that is, *if that which is required alſo elſe where is ſupplied.* Thou ſhalt be ſaved if thou repenteſt, provided thou alſo believeſt: and if thou believeſt thou ſhalt be ſaved, provided alſo thou repenteſt and walkeſt ſincerely before God. I mean, provided thou reſolves upon a changed upright life, and if thou art not prevented, bringeſt this reſolution to practice, there being no doubt but if a man dye before opportunity, his conſent to the Covenant is to be reckoned for obedience, and baptiſme alwayes waſhes away ſins with the Fathers. *Non concluditur legitime* (ſaies a judicious Proteſtant Divine) *a poſitione unius diſperati ad negationem alterius: neque ab eo quod aliquot locis docetur, ad negationem eorum quæ alibi aſſeruntur.* And this I take to be more after St. *Auſtin* and St. *James*, who do both methinks make faith the *initium & fundamentum* (to uſe his words) the *foundation* and *entrance* to obedience and good works, and ſo to juſtifie us as it is productive of them. We ſhall reconcile all I hope if we ſay only, that faith indeed may be *diſtinguiſhed*, when not *divided* from our obedience in our juſtification. That is in ſhort, *faith*, is one thing, and *juſtifying faith* is another, and yet juſtifying faith retain the common nature

ture ſtill of *faith*. Juſtifying faith, I take it, is ſuch a believing of, or truſting to Gods mercy, that he will pardon our ſins if we repent and walk ſincerely before him(which are the terms obtained for us through Chriſts redemption), as produces that repentance and ſincere walking. It is ſuch an *aſſent* to what God reveals, as carryes the *heart* and *life* along with it. I believe his *promiſes* (to wit effectually) when I ſo truſt them, as to do the things he requires of me to obtain them. I believe his *precepts* when I keep them. I believe his *threats*, when I abſtain from the evil he forbids, to avoid them. I believe the *Goſpel*, when I become Chriſts Diſciple. *Credere is fidelis eſſe* according to *Salvian*, and to be faithful is to doe our duty. *Well done good and faithful ſervant.*

For the latter, I do not apprehend ſeriouſly (if I may ſpeak freely my thoughts, to which very end do I write) but that there is a great deal more ſtir and difference among Divines in this point of *juſtification by faith* then needs in late times. If any man might meerly by his believing Chriſt dyed for him, and hath carryed away all ſin, be juſtified and ſaved, let him live as he liſt holding ſtill but this perſwaſion, there were ſomething in our contending for juſtification by faith alone, and a man would not be bereaved of the comfort of ſuch a doctrine for the World. But when we all agree that whether good works do juſtify or no, good works in the *reſolution*, and *practice* if not prevented, are neceſſary ſome way or other, ſo that no man living ever was or can be juſtified that is deſtitute of them, I doubt me verily our contention in this matter is rather *curious* then *profitable*, in ſhewing how faith *without works*, but not a faith, *which is without works* (at leaſt in the will and intention) does juſtify. I know our Divines againſt the Papiſts contend that faith juſtifies *in ſenſu correlativo*, or in regard of the object, ſo as to be juſtified by Chriſts blood, and by faith is all one, that is by faith in his blood. The righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed is the *formal* ſay ſome, or as others had rather ſay the *material* cauſe of our juſtification, and faith juſtifies as an inſtrument. For my own part I will tell you therefore what I have ſometimes ſet down for truth in my *contending belief*, and what I think in my cold *practical conceit* of the point.

As

As for my former thoughts I have ſome times pitched them thus. Juſtifying faith is the *receiving act* of a *working habit*, as hath the other act too to put forth upon trial, or elſe it is but a *dead* faith. Now this faith I have counted juſtifies as an *inſtrument*, not *mans*, who doeth not juſtify himſelf, but *Gods* inſtrument though mans act. This I have made out to my ſelf thus. Unto juſtification there goes two things, the *imputation* of Chriſts righteouſneſs for the diſcharge of ſin, and accepting us unto life: and a *valid donation* of it to the ſinner. The laſt is the ground of the former; for man muſt be *made juſt*, or God cannot reckon him ſo, and acquit him in judgement. *The judgement of God is according to truth.* Now to this making a man juſt, as there is this *donation* of God, there muſt be mans receiving, Chriſt is not ours though tendered or given until we receive him. This receiving then (which is our act, that is faith it ſelf) God excites, and make uſe of to this end. He makes uſe of it (I have accounted) as his inſtrument of making Chriſt ours, to this end he hath apppointed it for, that he may accordingly reckon his righteouſneſs to us, unto the remiſſion of ſin and everlaſting ſalvation.

Having told you this firſt, I may make the bolder to tell you my more indifferent thoughts of farther years. I do apprehend that the Apoſtles in their doctrine, and the Primitive Chriſtians, had more ſimple and leſs intricate conceptions of things then we have; and that their diſpute then whether we are juſtifyed by faith or works, in the moſt ſimple underſtanding of it, contains no more than to ſhew us what is required of perſons that they may be juſtified, or what is that God hath made the condition on our parts of our juſtification. *St. Auguſtine* I have ſaid, does teach us that faith does juſtifie us as the beginning and foundation unto grace and a good life, and the Council of *Trent* with *Bellarmine*, and the Papiſts after that Council ſt and upon this. Faith juſtifies only as *initium juſtificationis*, the beginning of juſtification. But howſoever the Papiſts have made uſe of that Father, the truth and light which he hath offered, is not to be loſt; I do take this to be the moſt right and certain notion that faith does juſtify as *initium* and *fundamentum*; I will not ſay *juſtificationis*, ſeeing I underſtand not juſtification to be all one with ſanctification as they do, but as *fundamentum*

condition's. The condition of our full & final justification the Gospel offers, is repentance and sincere obedience, and faith is the *initium* and *fundamentum* of that condition. *Was not* Abraham *our Father justified by works when he had offered his Son* Isaack, sayes St. *James*? The faith of *Abraham* or his believing God, was the beginning and foundation of this excellent work, the ready offering his Son, which shewed his sincerity of life, the condition of justification. *And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith* Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness.* Here *believing* & *offering Isaac* are all one with S. *James*. The offering *Isaack* proceeded from believing, as the *initium* and *fundamentum* of it, and so believing as the *initium* of sincerity of life or sincere obedience does justifie. Such a faith as produces good works which are sincere though imperfect, or such good works as proceed from faith, are but one and the same thing with the two Apostles, and made by both the condition of our justification.

And here I should be willing to come off: but the uniform judgement of the reformed Churches on the Article of Justification requires some regard. There is therefore in the Schools, a *Quatenus specificative, & reduplicative*. I suppose when I have said that faith does justifie us as the foundation of the condition (and so productive of the whole of it) I have said well with S. *Augustine* as to the *quatenus specificative*, and if I said nothing else it might be enough. Nevertheless, seeing it is but fit upon this account to speak yet a little more curiously, I must needs say farther, that I apprehend there is indeed something really in that which lyes in the concurring thoughts of our Divines, that faith hath, and must have a hand in our justification someway, as no other of our works or acts have. It is this. I believe that God will pardon me if I repent, and therefore I repent, as my faith now makes me repent and perform the condition, it justifies me, as to a *quatenus specificative*: but when I have repented and performed the condition, the duties I have performed are imperfect and sinful, and have need of mercy in point of law, and it is my faith yet must go to God for his acceptance of them through Christ when I have done. It is my faith, let me say, that must make up to me, out of the mercy or grace of God for Christs sake, what is wanting in that I have done

done, to make it ſuch as he may impute it to me for righteouſneſs, which elſe he could not. And as faith procures me this, or procures it thus, we have the *quatenus* alſo *reduplicative*, in the great queſtion how faith juſtifies. It is faith makes me perform the condition, and then finds acceptance for it being done; and as it does both, it does *ſpecificative*, and *reduplicative* juſtifie the ſinner. By this, it appears how faith hath an eye ſtill to pardon according to the Proteſtant, while it is oppoſed to works in the point of juſtification, which is not only as reſpecting the pardon of all our ſins upon the performing the condition: but as reſpecting that pardon more eſpecially which goes into the very accepting the condition performed; for when there is imperfection ſtill in our duty, and yet he accepts it, he muſt pardon alſo, what he accepts. And thus it is that the *juſt man* is ſaid to *live by faith* in the moſt ſubtle conception. The works which the juſt man does are *his righteouſneſs* moſt certainly, and that which juſtifies him; but they are ſhort, and he could not *live* in them, but that faith ſupplies (as I ſpeak) out of Gods pardon and grace, and conſequently out of the Covenant for Chriſts ſake, what is wanting otherwiſe for acceptation unto life. I do not ſay faith ſupplies this out of Chriſts merits, as if *his* and *our* obedience were mingled, to make up that *one* righteouſneſs that juſtifies us: but that it is our works which we perform our ſelves, is the condition, and through Chriſts merits, both the imperfection is pardoned, and they accepted, according to covenant, upon faith. *It is of faith* ſayes St. *Paul*, *that it might be of grace*. To be of *works*, is to need no grace: but to be of *faith*, is to have ſuch works as need to be pardoned, even when they are accepted of God, for Chriſts ſake, unto everlaſting ſalvation. When *Auguſtine* does tell us ſo often that faith juſtifies, *gratiam impetrando*, let us take *grace* in *his*, and alſo in *our* acception, and both together will compleat the notion. Faith goes to God for his grace, or *help*, whereby we perform the condition, and ſo juſtifies us: Faith goes to God alſo for his grace or *favour*, to pardon and accept what is done for Chriſts ſake, and ſo juſtifies us. As it does impetrate grace, or obtain his ſpirit for our duty: and then impetrates grace, or finds favour alſo for acceptance of it, take them both together, and we underſtand fully how we are juſtified by

Faith. As our truſting to a good man, does naturally draw out, win, or procure his aſſiſtance which yet is free and not of debt: ſo does our truſting in God for acceptance, when it hath firſt been effectual upon us to the performing our part to that end, procure the ſame from him to our juſtification. Let us take heed of making faith a *ſingle* act as it does *ſpecificative:* and a *complex* act, as it does *reduplicative* juſtifie the believer. Theſe are two extreams I think, and to be thus compoſed. And ſo you have my poor thoughts at full upon this vexed queſtion.

I come then to the third thing wherein the Father is out, and that is in his notion of juſtification it ſelf, which is the making us juſt, by infuſion. This the Papiſts have ſo improved, as in effect to exclude pardon from it. For while they place the work of juſtification in the aboliſhing of all ſin in the *baptized* and *juſtified*, ſo that there remains no longer any thing that is *peccatum*, but fomes *peccati* only, they do, I muſt ſay in effect, put us to diſpute with them, whether there be any remiſſion of ſins at all, ſeeing the wicked are not pardoned, and the juſtified have their ſins ſo done away by this infuſed grace, as to have none; and from hence does there ſpring their doctrine of *merit*, and *perfection*, which the controverſie of *juſtification by works*, does carry along with it. Now I doubt not but the truth here (as it doth every where), is ſuffering between two theives. That there is no *merit* or *perfection* I am convinced, and that our works do not *merit* becauſe they are not *perfect*: but that we are juſtified by *works*, as we are by *faith*, St. *James* his words muſt goe as well as St. *Pauls*, and both muſt ſtand good, becauſe faith juſtifies only as productive of works. Juſtification indeed is by *works*, but not *meritorious works*: by works which make the reward to be of *grace*, but not by works which make the reward to be of *debt*, ſo the Apoſtles are before reconciled. There are two queſtions then may adjuſt this great matter between Us and the Papiſts, or unto which the iſſue of our diſputes on this point may be reduced. In the one they have the advantage of us, in the other we have the better of them. The lover of truth muſt be humbly hardned to follow its footſteps whereſoever he finds them, whither on the one ſide or the other.

The firſt queſtion is, whether the righteouſneſs we perform

our ſelves, or that Chriſt performed for us, be the *matter* of our juſtification? and I ſay, the faith, repentance, new obedience, which the Chriſtian through divine aid performes himſelf, is accepted with God for Chriſts ſake unto pardon of ſin, and eternal life. It is true, the obedience of Chriſt wrought for us, does juſtifie us *ſuo genere*, by meriting the pardoning, juſtifying Covenant, which is the donative inſtrument of pardon and life: But if the queſtion be askt, whether we have performed that which this inſtrument requires as *conditio tituli*, it muſt be our own faith and repentance here that is the *matter* of our righteouſneſs. A man may be juſt in reſpect to the law of innocency, which no man but Chriſt ever was: or in reſpect to the law of grace, which all are, and muſt be, that are ſaved. Again, a man may be juſt in reſpect to the *perceptive* part of a law: or the *retributive* part. It is Chriſts righteouſneſs and ſacrifice alone that juſtifies Us in regard of the one, but not ſo in regard of the other: yet is it that alone which is the meritorious cauſe both of the acceptation of what we do, and freedom from the Laws condemnation. The ſecond queſtion is, whether ſalvation then and juſtification is not according to our *merits*? And I anſwer, as the Scripture is cleer and full from one end to the other for the *affirmative* in the *former* queſtion: ſo is the Apoſtle *Paul* as full and cleer and poſitive as can be for the *negative* in the *latter*. What is it indeed he beats upon but this altogether? that there are no works in the earth (Chriſts excepted) that do merit: and that juſtification and ſalvation therefore are of grace. *Not of works, but of grace.* What is that in the ſenſe and meaning, but as much as if he ſhould have ſaid it in expreſs terms, not of *merit*, but of *grace*, or, not of works that are meritorious, and would make the reward to be of debt: but of ſuch works that though they be rewarded, it is of grace, and more then in juſtice according to the law, God needed to have done. For this is the meaning of the Apoſtle in excluding of merit. There is a paternal government according to the law of grace wherein the denyal of a reward due to our works were to overthrow all religion: A good child by his filial behaviour merits love and benefits: We diſpute not unleſs *de nomine* only, againſt ſuch a merit as this. But as to a merit

in

in Gods *ſtrict diſtributive* juſtice according to the law of works or any *other* juſtice which ſhould make our works to be meritorious *ex condigno, non ſolum ratione pacti & acceptationis, ſed ratione operis*, as *Bellarmine* with the Papiſts does ſpeak, St. *Paul* is full in the deryal. It is nothing elſe certainly but the miſapprehenſion of the word *grace* in St. *Auſtin*, received by the Church of *Rome* from him, that could have blinded them ſo in this point. I have ſhown his miſtake in this term, and in thoſe of *works*, and *grace*, and have and do here give you the right ſenſe of each according to the Apoſtle. The certain truth is this, God gave a law to man according to his creation, and if he had performed that, or any of us could perform that, then ſhould he as Creator and Rector be engaged to reward the performance according to this law, ſo that the reward ſhould be of right: but ſeeing man is fallen, and no Perſon on earth does or can perform that law, there are no works on earth that do properly merit, or no man on earth that can be juſtified, if he have only his deſert by his works. This is undoubtedly the very entendment of the Apoſtle. That all *boaſting* and *merit* may be excluded from the world, while it is proved that no mortal is juſtified or ſaved but by *grace*. And what need further conviction in this matter? we have the Papiſts own words, and general confeſſions, that they are all ſinners, and that it is through Chriſts merits that they merit. If they are ſinners then have they not theſe works that are meritorious, but it muſt be of mercy that they are not condemned; and if it be through Chriſts merits that they merit, then is the reward not for the *work* ſake, but for *his*. And what is it that Chriſt hath *merited*, that they ſhould *merit*? It muſt come to this, that Chriſt by what he hath done for us, hath merited or procured this grace or favour from God, that he ſhould accept of our imperfect performances, which could not elſe be accepted, to ſalvation. Of this grace he hath made and promulgated the *promiſe*. Upon the promiſe the reward becomes *due*. A reward upon promiſe the condition being performed, becomes debt. And thus if the Papiſts ſay their good works merit, the uſe of the word is common with the Antients. Well then, let me recount this back to them, their good works merit,

that

that is only, they make the reward due from God. They make it due from him, that is only becauſe of his promiſe. *Debet ſibi, non tibi*, ſayes the Father. This promiſe is only of grace, or made freely out of favour procured by Chriſt. Our good works then muſt have ſuch a merit attributed to them, as makes the reward due only of *grace* and for *Chriſts ſake*: and not ſuch as makes it due of *right* or juſtice, and for the *works ſake*. And ſuch a merit, what is it indeed but no merit, or but a word only? It is ſuch a merit as our perfect works which anſwer the law would have if we did them, to make the reward to be ſo of *debt*, as *not* to be of *grace*, that we diſpute againſt, and the Apoſtle, in this doctrine of juſtification.

To return to *Auguſtines* errour. Juſtification I verily believe is to be taken in the Proteſtants notion, who do no leſs truly and judiciouſly, then induſtriouſly diſtinguiſh ſanctification and juſtification: and when they place the one in the work of the ſpirit renewing the whole man, and enabling us to dye unto ſin, and live unto God, do place the other in an act of Gods grace whereby he pardoneth all our ſins, and accepteth us as righteous for Chriſts ſake. As for what they add uſually in the definition that Chriſts righteouſneſs is imputed to us, and made ours by faith as an inſtrument, I muſt confeſs they are notions, which as they never came into the head of St. *Auſtine*, nor were received (I ſuppoſe) in the Church till within a century or two of years ſince: ſo do I queſtion whether a Century or two more may not wear them quite away again. That the righteouſneſs of Chriſt performed in the whole courſe of his life and death was ſo pleaſing, acceptable, and ſatisfactory to God, that the whole World upon that account, or for the merit of it, ſtands reconciled to him ſo far as that he hath vouchſafed a univerſal conditional pardon, or law of grace, to all mankind, according to the tenour of the Goſpel, and conſequently that every Perſon who truly repents and believes, are made partakers thereof in regard of this benefit, or in the effect, is a truth which we embrace: but when this very phraſe of the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs is not found in the Scripture, and the terms are uſed conſtantly in ſuch a ſenſe as if we were to be taken for perfectly righteous in Chriſts obedience, and to have

ſatis-

ſatisfied the law in his ſufferings all one as if our ſelves had performed the ſame, that is, as if it were ours, *in it ſelf*, and not only in the *benefit*, or as to the end or intent Chriſt performes it for us, it is a conception of ſuch another extream to that of St. *Auguſtines*, as requires alſo our equal rectification.

It is manifeſt through the Scripture, that good works, holy duties and performances of men and women, are accepted of God, and ſo accepted, that they are rewarded by him with eternal Salvation. *If thou wilt have life, keep the commandements. To them who by patient continuance in well doing ſeek for glory, eternal life. I have fought the good fight, therefore is laid up for me a Crown of righteouſneſs. Come ye bleſſed of my Father, for when I was a hungry ye fed me.* If then the keeping the Commandements, a patient continuance in well doing, the fighting the good fight, and our works of charity be produced in judgment, as that for which we are declared righteous, abſolved and pronounced bleſſed, It muſt be in ſome ſounder then the ordinary ſenſe, that our Divines bring in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be imputed to us for our juſtification; which if it be more then abſolution from ſin, and acceptation of us to eternal life, let it be weighed and judged.

In *Ezekiel* the Lord is ſpeaking of the righteous man, and repenting ſinner. *When the righteous turneth from his righteouſneſs and committeth iniquity, ſhall he live? his righteouſneſs ſhall not be mentioned, but in his ſin which he hath ſinned, he ſhall dye* Again, *If the Wicked turn from his ſinnes and does that which is right, all his tranſgreſſions which he hath committed ſhall not be mentioned; in his righteouſneſs that he hath done he ſhall live.* It is apparent from hence, that there is a righteouſneſs which is a mans own, a righteouſneſs which he hath *done*, wherein the righteous man that continues in it, or the penitent ſinner that turns to it, ſhall *live*. To live in a mans righteouſneſs beyond doubt, is all one to be juſtified by it. *He that doth them* ſaith the law *ſhall live in them*, that is ſhall be juſtified by them. If you make a queſtion, there is another Text muſt convince you. *The juſt man ſhall live by his faith.* What is it to live by our faith? that you will not deny, is to be juſtified by it; for the Apoſtle alleadges this Scripture to prove juſtification

fication by Faith. Well! There is no man of reaſon now can imagine that the righteouſneſs which is here ſpoken of, is Chriſts righteouſneſs, and yet the righteouſneſs which is here, is that, a man ſhall live in. It follows, that it is not therefore the righteouſneſs of Chriſt from without imputed, but the righteouſneſs which man himſelf does (through Chriſt indeed and his ſpirit aſſiſting) whereby he muſt be juſtified and ſaved. It is by his *faith* that he ſhall live in one Prophet, and by his *righteouſneſs which he hath done*, in another. Put them together, and they come to one, as they muſt doe, and that is, by the righteouſneſs of faith; to wit, by that righteouſneſs of life, or holy working which faith produces in a godly mans converſation, and which God requires every where as the condition of the forgiveneſs of his ſins, and the acceptation of him to life everlaſting.

It is obſerved by *Arminius* that the Apoſtle does ſeveral times in one Chapter (I forget the number,) tell us that faith is imputed for righteouſneſs. That *Abrahams was*, that ours *ſhall*, or *is*, again and again. But it is no where ſaid that Chriſts righteouſueſs is imputed to us for righteouſneſs. Indeed the phraſe could not be ſo uſed. We might ſay properly enough (ſuppoſing it true in the common conſtruction) that Chriſts righteouſneſs were imputed: but not imputed for righteouſneſs. For to be imputed for righteouſneſs is to ſtand one in ſtead of perfect righteouſneſs, which cannot be ſaid of Chriſts, ſeeing that it ſelf was moſt perfect. A thing cannot be accounted inſtead of that which it is. This Argument now of *Arminius* is good. It is faith which is a mans own act that is imputed for righteouſneſs, therefore, not the righteouſneſs, acts, or obedience of another. But when this acute Divine would introduce a notion hereupon, that the τὸ *credere*, therefore muſt juſtifie us, and not *works*, or not the τὸ *operari*, it is both an ill and weak conceit, which is neither of uſe nor value. For as the Scripture ſpeaks of *faith* being accounted for righteouſneſs, ſo does it tell us that *Abrahams offering his Son*, and *Phineas* act were accounted to them for righteouſneſs, and that *Rahabs* hiding the Spies did juſtifie her. That is, it is faith as productive of works, or works as produced by faith that receives

the reward of perfect righteousnes, which is, we are to remember also for Christs sake, or through his merits; not imputed to us as proprietors, but prevailing with the Father for such terms for sinners as answers our redemption and grace of the Gospel.

I would fain know of any man who is most Orthodox in his complexion, whether he does, or is able to think, that *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Job*, who were before the law, *Samuel*, the *Kings* and *Prophets*, who were under the law, or any man or woman whatsoever before the coming of Christ, did ever imagine that they were righteous, and to be accepted with God for the obedience which the *Messiah* should perform in their behalf when he came into the world, and that the believing this was an instrument of making it to be theirs, and so to be imputed to them which it could not be else: or whether they did not look on themselves to be righteous by doing righteously, and to obtain Gods favour by their upright walking with him, and no otherwise in the World? They judged not their own righteousnes the meritorious cause of pardon to answer the Curse of the Law of Innocency, but they believed in Gods mercy, and so repented, obeyed, and were saved through the Redeemer. *And* Enoch *walked with God, and God took him.* Blessed is the man sayes *David* who *walkes in his wayes, and to whom he imputeth no sin.* In the acceptation then of a mans own upright walking, and in the pardon of his sins, did our justification and blessednes lye in *Davids* time: and in the same no doubt does it lye still under the Gospel. I would yet fain know whether any of the Disciples, *James*, *John* or *Paul* himself, whether *Clemens Roman*, or *Alexandrine*, *Justin Martyr*, *Cyprian*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, or any of the Fathers, whether Councels, or School-men, whether *John Hus*, or *Wickliffe*, or any famous or holy Writer (without resting on some bare incoherent scraps of sentences) did ever understand, or receive the full notion of faiths instrumentality, and the imputation of a passive righteousnes before *Luther?* And if not, whether it be possible it should be of any such moment as is made of it by most Protestants? It was an Article indeed that raigned in *Martins* heart, and I do therefore give it my obeysance: but it is no

Article

Article I take it, as the remiſſion of ſins is, in the Creed of the Apoſtles.

If the righteouſneſs of Chriſt be imputed to us (as if it were ours in it ſelf) it muſt be the righteouſneſs of his *active*, or *paſſive* obedience, or *both*. If his *active* obedience be imputed to us, then muſt we be lookt upon in him as ſuch who have committed no ſin, nor omitted any duty, and then what need will there be of Chriſts death! how ſhall Chriſt dye for our ſins if we be lookt on in Chriſt as having none at all? If Chriſts *paſſive* obedience be imputed, then muſt we be look't on as ſuch who in Chriſt have ſuffered and ſatisfied the law, and born the full curſe of it; and then how ſhall there be room for any pardon? The man who payes his full debt by himſelf or ſurety, can in no ſenſe be forgiven by his Creditour. Indeed the Argument of the *Socinian* from pardon againſt Chriſts ſatisfaction is not valid: but it is good againſt the imputation of it to us as if we our ſelves had ſatisfied. Chriſt may have wrought with the Father (or made him that ſatisfaction as) to procure new terms, ſo that a man may be juſtifyed as a fulfiller of them, and yet need pardon for non-performance of the old. If Chriſts active and paſſive obedience both are imputed, then muſt God be made to deal with man according to the *Covenant of works* in the buſineſs of his juſtification, when nothing is more apparent in the Scripture than that by *grace* it is, that a man is juſtified, and by *grace* ſaved. If nothing leſs then ſuch a righteouſneſs as does both anſwer, and ſatisfie the law alſo, and that fully, will ſuffice for the ſinners plea to free him from condemnation, he is not judged by the *law of grace*, but he is judged by the *law of works*, out of queſtion. There were no need to bring this notion of Chriſts imputed righteouſneſs into the Church, but that our Proteſtants miſtake themſelves, and forget that we are juſtified and ſaved by the Covenant of Grace, and not by the law of *Moſes*, or Covenant of our Creation. Chriſt came into the World to procure and tender a new law, and in this regard is he ſaid to be our Law-giver: not that he hath given any other moral rules of life to us (for we know his commandement only is *Love*) than what was contained in the Law before, wherein ſome do but boldly impoſe upon themſelves

and others: but that he hath given the ſame precepts with *indulgence*. If God then ſhall not deal with man in his juſtification here, and at judgment according to that *indulgence*, or according to the law now in Chriſts hands, that is according to the Covenant of Grace, the main buſineſs of Chriſt coming and redemption were loſt. You ſhall hear a Proteſtant in his prayer appealing from the Tribunal of Gods juſtice, to the throne of his grace, and yet in his Sermon be telling the people that it is nothing elſe but the perfect obedience and ſatisfaction of Chriſt imputed to them that ſaves them; which is to bring them back from the *throne of his grace*, to the *bar of his juſtice* to be judged. Such appeals have been received I ſuppoſe from the Fathers, as very ſignificant of truth, and their meaning: but not agreeable to this notion.

In the laſt place, there is a righteouſneſs revealed in the Goſpel, that God went by in his dealing with all the holy men and women who were before Chriſt, and which he goes by in his dealing with us now and all the World, whereby it is that we are juſtified in oppoſition to the *righteouſneſs of works*, the which together with the *grace of the Goſpel* in the true ſenſe and import thereof, is kept out of the *Proteſtant underſtanding* by this notion of the rigid imputation of Chriſts righteouneſs in it ſelf, that being alſo but a late and forced notion, and not tending to holyneſs of life, (though they have bin holy men that have received it.) It is on the hearts I find of ſeveral Perſons, and ſorts of Perſons diſagreeing otherwiſe in their way (the providence of the Almighty who is the Authour, being the Conductor of all truth to its proper uſe and end,) to ſhew themſelves againſt it, and to advance this tenent (if I may offer the determination) to the contrary. That the juſtification of a ſinner is not by the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs made his in it ſelf by faith as an inſtrument: but by the *righteouſneſs of faith*, to wit, by Chriſts righteouſnes, as the meritorious cauſe, and his faith and reſolution firſt, and ſincere obedience added after, as the condition of pardon and life through him: or by our ſincere obedience proceeding from faith, which being in it ſelf but imperfect as to the Law, is imputed for righteouſneſs to the ſinner for Chriſts merits ſake, through the grace of the Goſpel.

But now the righteouſneſs of God without the law is manifeſted

feſted, having witneſs of the Law and the Prophets. *Si ergo nunc manifeſtata eſt, etiam tunc erat ſed occulta. If it be now manifeſted, it muſt have bin before lying hid. Aug. de peccato originali cont. Pel. & Cel. c. 25. Et tunc ergo iſta gratia mediatoris erat in populo Dei, ſed tanquam in vellere pluvia. And then was there this grace of the Mediator among Gods people as the rain in the fleece,* that is, though unſeen or not underſtood. *Ib.* I obſerve here that the *righteouſneſs of God,* and the *grace* of the Mediator, is rightly made by this Father to be one. We are ſaid to be juſtified by *grace,* and not by *works* : ſo by the *righteouſneſs which is of God,* and not of *works.* What then is that righteouſneſs of God which is the grace of Chriſt, and by which we are juſtified? By this grace and righteouſneſs, it is certain, that *Auſtine* underſtands inherent grace, which is a quality infuſed by the Spirit in our hearts, enabling us to good works, and that this way do the Papiſts go after him, according to what alſo is ſaid before. *Iſtam quippe gratiam qua juſtificamur, id eſt, qua Charitas Dei diffunditur in cordibus noſtris__ De gratia Chriſti, c.* 30. that is, *the grace whereby we are juſtified, is no other but the love of God ſhed abroad in our hearts,* or the grace of Charity whereby faith is made perfect, and ſo juſtifies as they and he agree. Now this grace is oppoſed to works, and called the righteouſneſs *which is of God,* and not of *works* according to them (which hath been ſaid before likewiſe) becauſe it is that which is given or infuſed of God, and not wrought by our own ſtrength, or procured by our deſerts. *Juſtitia ex lege dicitur quæ fit propter legis mandatum, juſtitia ex Deo dicitur quæ datur per gratiæ beneficium. Ib. c.* 12. *That is ſaid to be the righteouſneſs of the law or of works, which is done through the ſtrength of our ſelves only upon the command : that is the righteouſneſs of God which we are helpt to do by he benefit of grace.* Again, *Non dicitur juſtitia noſtra ſed Dei, quia ſic ſit noſtrum ut nobis ex Deo. It is not ſaid our righteouſneſs, but the righteouſneſs of God becauſe it is ours ſo as to be firſt given of God.* In the ſame Chapter and Book. The truth is this Father being poſſeſſed with his own diſpute, as it is incidental to the mind to faſhion all things according to the impreſſions it hath received, does frame ſuch a meaning ſtill in the words of the Apoſtle, as

if

if *Paul* as well as he, were purposely writing against *Pelagius*. There are three things in the soul said that learned Person, *Posse*, *Velle*, & *Esse*, *Possibilitas*, *Voluntas* & *Actio*, as *Austin* expresses it, the *Power*, the *Will*, and the *Deed*. The grace of God he accounted was conversant only about the *Power*, and not the *Will*, or the *Action*. Not that he placed all grace only in the giving the power, for that must confound Grace and Nature indeed quite, seeing all have the power: but allowing grace to lye in divine *help*, the *power* alone he held was *aided* by God, and the *will* left to its self. This *aid* now in explaining himself he confined to Doctrine. God he said does reveal what he would have done in his law, and in the gospel, and gives us besides Christs example, and then the will of it self (the power alone thus helped) embraces that which is good. St. *Augustine* therefore sets himself to prove, that God does not assist us only by his word, but by operating on the will, and giving us hearts also to do it. And for as much we do nothing of our selves but by his help, or by the operation of his spirit, it is by grace, sayes he, that we are justified, and not by works. *Quomodo est gratia si non gratis data? quomodo est gratia si ex debito redditur? How is it grace if it be not of free gift? How is it grace if it be rendred as debt? De gra. Chr. c.* 23. Again, *Non enim Dei gratia erit ullo modo nisi gratuita fuerit omni modo. It cannot be the grace of God at all, if it be not free altogether, De pec. or. c.* 24. One would think this Father in such speeches as these had imbibed the Protestant notion of *grace*; but we are mistaken, for his thoughts still ran upon the Grace of God infused in our hearts, that is, the inherent work of the spirit which he pleads to be *gratuitous*, because it is not at *first* given for our *merits*. The works which we do of our selves without grace he accounts merits nothing, but are splendid sinnes: the works which we do from grace or by the spirit do justifie according to him, and merit eternal salvation. *Quod si vocatus vocantem secutus fuerit, quod est in libero arbitrio, merebitur & spiritum sanctum per quem bona possit operari: in quo permanens quod nihilominus est in libero arbitrio, merebitur vitam aternam quæ nulla possit labi corrumpi. But if he that is called shall follow his call, which is in our free will, he shall merit the holy Ghost,*

by

by whose help good works may be performed: wherein if he perseveres, which is no less in his power, he shall merit eternal life, which is perfect and never fadeth away. In lib. expos. ad Romanes. The Protestant meeting with this doctrine in the Papist are no wayes satisfied with such an interpretation. By the *Righteousness of God* therefore, as by the *grace* of God, opposed to *works*, they will by all means conceive of a righteousness without us, that is the righteousness of Christ, which is not ours by *performance*, but by *faith*. But neither the Protestants after *Luther*, nor the Papist after *Austine* have hit the mind of the Apostle. The *righteousness of God* and *grace* opposed to *works* is really nothing else but the meritorious righteousness of Christ, procuring the pardoning Covenant of grace, and our performing the condition: that is, the righteousness of the Covenant of *grace* accepted by God for Christs sake, instead of the righteousness of the Covenant of *works*. Only we are to know this *righteousness* may be understood either with respect to *God* as it is all one I say with his *grace*: or with respect to *Us*, as it is all one with that, upon which this grace is vouchsafed. *Charitas Dei dicta est diffundi in cordibus nostris, non qua nos ipse diligit, sed qua nos facit dilectores suos: sicut justitia Dei, qua justi ejus munere efficimur. As it is called the love of God whereby we are made to love him, so the righteousness of God whereby we are made righteous through his gift. Aug. de spir. & lit. c.* 32. It is true that this righteousness is wrought in us by the spirit, and flowes not from our selves; it is true also that as we performe it by his aid, it is our own work: yet is not the one the reason why it is called the *righteousness of God*, nor the other any hindrance why it should not be so called: for the reason lyes altogether in the opposition of it meerly to that of *works*. Let a man do all that he can, whether by his own strength, or by Gods aid, he can never come up to the law of works, or to a conformity to the terms of the Covnant of *nature*, or law of *Moses*, as it was a representation of that Covenant, so that by the deeds thereof he cannot be justified: and for as much as it pleased God therefore to vouchsafe us a new law, the law of faith, or grace, or the new Covenant having lower terms, that in the performance hereof, or in a conformity

formity only hereunto, the man who is a ſinner in reſpect of the law, may be righteous, and ſo God juſt in juſtifying him; this grace and condeſcention of God being meerly from his own good will, is called thus the *righteouſneſs which is of him*, in oppoſition to the other which is of *nature:* and ſo were ours, *or mans righteouſneſs* properly, if he could attain unto the ſame. But when he cannot attain unto that which is ſo by *nature*, whatſoever he attains, if it be leſs, muſt be a righteouſneſs only through *grace*, which notwithſtanding our ſhortneſs, God mercifully condeſcends to accept, inſtead of that which is perfect, through the merits of our Saviour, and in regard of that acceptation (*N. B.*) it is called *his*, or the righteouſneſs *which is of him* (of his own free tender and allowance), when in regard of performance it is ours, though we do it by his help. Lo here the true key that opens the mind of the Apoſtle , and conſequently the door to that treaſure which depends upon it.

That which is ſaid I know by our Proteſtants moſt to the quick is this , that *pardon* indeed is an act of meer *grace*, but *juſtification* is an act of *juſtice* according to law, and therefore muſt Chriſts righteouſneſs which alone does anſwer the law be brought in to juſtifie the believer. But this is a miſtake, for if juſtification lyes not altogether in pardon [*Even as* David *deſcribeth the bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works, ſaying, bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven*] it is at leaſt one part of it, and the whole is expreſly declared by the Apoſtle to be *by grace, being juſtified freely by his grace.* True indeed it is an act of *righteouſneſs*, even a judicial or forenſical act, that is according to law, but what law ? not the *law of works*, but according to the *law of Faith.* It is an act I ſay of that *righteouſneſs* of God, and no other which the Apoſtle ſets forth in oppoſition to the *law* and *works*, and makes all one with his *grace.* To reckon it then an act of juſtice according to the Law, intending thereby the law of works, is to correct the Apoſtle, and to tell him we know better how we are juſtified by Chriſt then he. It is the underſtanding of this righteouſneſs whereof we are now ſpeaking will ſet us all right. It is Chriſts obedience and ſufferings alone no doubt which could make any compenſation to God for our

ſins,

ſins, that he might without diminuition to his honour as Law-giver, or Governour, recede from his firſt law, but when Chriſt hath by his ſatisfaction procured this that God ſhould now deal with us by a new law, the remedying law, or upon other terms, the thing is manifeſt in itſelf, that the righteouſneſs then which is pleaded and accepted for this ſatisfaction ſake of Chriſt, muſt be this righteouſneſs of the new law, or the righteouſneſs of *faith* and not of *works*; which both denominates the performer righteous, and God juſt in juſtifying him according to it. *For Chriſt is the end of the law for righteouſneſs to every one that believeth.* That is, as I conſtrue it, Chriſt by his ſatisfaction hath procured that we ſhould not be judged by the law of works, and conſequently that righteouſneſs, or juſtification, be attained if we do but perform the terms of the Goſpel. *To declare I ſay at this time his righteouſneſs that he might be juſt and a juſtifyer of him that belives in Jeſus. Who is made unto us of God,* (that is a phraſe I take it ſignifying no more then through whom (one way or other) God would have us obtain all ſpiritual bleſſings) *wiſdome, righteouſneſs, ſanctification, and redemption.*

After this there are no texts I count (ſuch as the laſt purpoſely mentioned) which are preſſed by our Divines for their ſervice before, that are able to carry ſuch a burden. *He hath made him ſin for us* (ſin, as the expiatory ſacrifice under the law is called ſin) *who knew no ſin, that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him.* That is, he who was the imaculate Lamb was made a ſacrifice for our ſins, that we may become righteous with the righteouſneſs of God, which he accepts through him. Chriſt as a Sacrifie redeems us from the law of ſin, and purchaſes for us a law of grace: according to that law we have a righteouſneſs which is accepted unto life through Chriſt. I pray note it therefore, it is not ſaid that his righteouſneſs might be made ours, nor that we might be made his righteouſneſs: but that we might be made *the righteouſneſs of God.* And what is the righteouſneſs of God I have ſhewen you juſt now, and what *in him* likewiſe is declared here together with it, in theſe few words. *Ut ſimus juſtitia Dei in ipſo. Hæc eſt illa juſtitia Dei, non qua ipſe juſtus eſt, ſed qua nos ab eo facti.* That we ſhould become the righteouſneſs of God

in him. This is that righteouſneſs of God, not whereby he is righteous, but whereby we are made ſo of him. Auguſtine again, in the laſt cited place. It is true then there is a righteouſneſs, of *faith*, and righteouſneſs of *God* (of faith as the root of the whole condition) which are one, and by which in oppoſition to the *righteouſneſs of works* we are juſtified: but that this righteouſneſs of *God* and of *Faith*, is only the obedience of Chriſts life and death which he performed for us, is aſſumed as much without reaſon, as any conſent of that Father. To this purpoſe, I take it, is God ſtyled in the Old Teſtament, *The Lord our righteouſneſs*, that is, in his condeſcention to accept us for Chriſts ſake as righteous by a law of grace, when in ſtrict juſtice he might condemn us for ſinners. It is not appropriated to the ſecond Perſon, but to be underſtood of that Goſpel goodneſs of God whereby he imputeth righteouſneſs to us, when we have none according to the law of our creation, that is imputing the righteouſneſs of faith to us without the works of that Covenant. *All our merits O Lord* (ſayes the Father) *are thy mercy*. This is the true and exellent import of that expreſſion, ſignifying moreover that God hath found out the means to demonſtrate his juſtice no leſs fully (and his goodneſs more fully) to the World in ſaving us by this new law, through his Sons mediation, then if we had kept our firſt innocency, or underwent his eternal judgment for our tranſgreſſions.

Another text which is a fellow with this, I take it in ſenſe and words, is that to the *Romans*. *As by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners: ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous:* I comment theſe words thus. As through *Adams* ſin we came into the ſtate of the fall, and ſo do all ſin, or are ſinners againſt the law, which none fulfil: ſo by Chriſts obedience to his Father whereby he procured the grace of a new law for us we are brought to ſuch a ſtate, as that many become righteous, and are juſtified by the performance. That all man-kind is involved in *Adams* firſt ſin, our Divines are agreed againſt *Pelagius*. The moſt underſtand this to come through the *Covenant* or *Will* of God: there are ſome apt to conceive only that *Adam* being the natural root of mankind, human nature it ſelf ſinned in him, and ſo when we come to

exiſt

exiſt, his guilt is derived upon our perſons as *virtually* and *ſeminally* in him, no otherwiſe then *Levi* is ſaid to have paid tyths to *Melchiſedech* in the loyns of *Abraham*. I ſhould incline to this explanation, but that I ſee not then why all the ſins of *Adam* beſides, and of all our Progenitors, ſhould not be *ours* alſo upon the ſame account, as much as that *firſt* tranſgreſſion. Diſtinguiſh we therefore between the *precept*, thou ſhalt not eat of the Tree, under this Covenant: and the *threatning* upon breach of it. The Precept plainly belong'd to our firſt Parents only, and as none of us broke that precept which we had not, ſo can we not be reputed to have that ſin (in it ſelf) which we never committed: nevertheleſs the penalty being by the Will or Covenant of God to extend to their progeny (which falls out ordinarily in mans laws alſo), that ſin of *Adams* which *in it ſelf* could be *his* only, in the *effects* threatned upon the commiſſion does become *ours* alſo. God does ſo impute that act to us, that we are all, as well as he, deprived of original righteouſneſs, corrupted in our nature, and ſure to dye: In like manner (I take it) are we to conceive of the imputation both of our ſins to Chriſt, and of his righteouſueſs to us. Our ſins are not laid upon him to make him a ſinner: but to be a propitiation for our ſins. He was not made ſin or accounted a ſinner, *quoad reatum culpæ*, as if he were guilty of our facts, but he was dealt with as a ſinner, *quoad reatum pœnæ*, in regard to the obligation unto ſatisfaction, which as a *Sponſor* he was to make in our behalf. The righteouſneſs of Chriſt likewiſe which he performed as *Sponſor* or *Mediator*, cannot be ours either really or repreſentatively *in it ſelf*, becauſe this righteouſneſs as Mediator is proper to his Perſon, and is not the very ſame required of any, or all of us in the law it ſelf: but his righteouſneſs as Mediator, even his whole ſubmiſſion to the law of his Mediatorſhip in life and death, is ours *reſpectively* as to what it procured, or to what he intended it ſhould procure, in aſmuch as we are partakers of the benefits that derive from it. Our *ſins* were *Chriſts* in the *cauſation* of his ſufferings: Chriſts *righteouſnes* is *ours* in the *effects* of pardon and life eternal.

A third text, and which carryes our Divines I think more then any, is that to the *Phillipians*. *I count all things but loſs*

that I may win Christ, and be found in him not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith. In these words, our Protestants observe that the righteousness of God, and of faith, is opposed to that righteousness which is our *own*, and therefore it must be a righteousness *without Us*, received by faith. But they are mistaken, for, besides that the righteousness of *faith* and of *God*, is not the same with the righteousness of *Christ*, as hath been before observed, they are to know that this righteousness which *Paul* calls his *own* in this Text, is the righteousness of the *Jew*, that is, the *Jews own*, or his own as a *Jew* and a *Pharisee*; not *our own*, or his own as a Christian. This appears from the Verses before. *If any thinketh that he hath whereof he may trust in the flesh, I more, circumcised the eighth day, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law a Pharisee, as touching the righteousness which of the law blameless.* This appears farther from another text, which together with this alone is all that hath any such Antithesis in the Terms τῆς ἰδίας δικαιοσύνης, from whence they fetch this conjecture. *I bear them record that they have a Zeal for God, but not according to knowledg. For they being ignorant of Gods righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God.* It is certain now from these places both, that there is a righteousness which was *Pauls own* and the *Jews own* which he excluds from justification, and opposes to the righteousness of *faith* and of *God:* but this I say is not the *Christian* righteousness. The Christians faith and new obedience are his own acts out of doubt by Gods help, and *his* righteousness according to the Gospel: and you shall never read St. *Paul* saying, *I desire to be found in Christ not having my own repentance, my own* faith, love, and new obedience, which are conditions of being *found in him* that we may be justifyed. *Pauls* own righteousness as a *Jew*, or as a *Pharisee* I say is one thing, and *Pauls* faith and obedience which is his righteousness as a *Christian* is another. And this distinction our Saviour himself hath first offered. *Except your righteousness, exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees.*— The righteousness of works is twofold. The righteousness

ouſneſs of *Mankind*, according to the Covenant of Nature: and the righteouſneſs of the *Jewes*, while they reckoned to be juſtified by the external obſervation only of the rites of *Moſes*. The one of theſe *exceeds* the righteouſneſs of faith, and we are not juſtified by it, becauſe no man can attain to it: the other *falls ſhort* of the righteouſneſs of faith, or of a true Chriſtian, according to theſe words of our Lord, and for that reaſon, as for ſeveral others, the eſtabliſhment of it was dangerous to their Salvation.

A laſt text they have, *what the law could not do in that it was weak through the fleſh, God ſending his own Son in the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh, and for ſin condemned ſin in the fleſh: that the righteouſneſs of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the fleſh but after the Spirit.* It is urged here by a Perfectiſt, that if the Proteſtant doctrine were true, it ſhould be ſaid that the righteouſneſs of the law ſhould be fulfilled in Chriſt, and not in us. But theſe words I apprehend may be a phraſe of the Apoſtles, as the words *attaining unto righteouſneſs* otherwhere: and ſo it will be all one as if he had ſaid, *that we might be juſtified, who walk not after the fleſh, but after the Spirit.* Nevertheleſs, there is this here muſt be known and noted, that when a Chriſtian obeys God according to the Goſpel, that obedience of his proceeding from faith, though imperfect, is accepted of God inſtead of the laws perfect righteouſneſs, or ſtands him in the ſtead as if the whole law were fulfilled, which is the ground of ſuch expreſſions. From whence in the way we may have light for the underſtanding the Apoſtle, when he tells us *the law is eſtabliſhed by faith*, or uſes the like words. The law is eſtabliſhed only by the fulfilling of it: and faith as it works by love fulfils the law. But how? why in the ſenſe (*N. B.*) as is now told you. Faith produces obedience which is imperfect, yet anſwering the terms of the goſpel, it is, through that grace and condeſcention from God which Chriſt hath purchaſed for us in the work of our redemption, imputed to us for righteouſneſs, that is, accepted and rewarded ſo, as it is made to ſtand us in the ſame ſtead as the full performance of the law would have done, which is to juſtifie us, and bring us life eternal.

When God made man he gave him a law ſuitable to his Creation.

on. That law being founded in the image of God, wherein he was created, is moſt holy, equal, and unchangeable. God as Rector muſt deal with the World according to this law, ſo that man tranſgreſſing, he is engaged to proceed againſt him by it, unleſs there be ſome means found out that he may be no loſer in his juſtice if he do not. There is nothing can be offered to God but his juſtice and holineſs muſt be loſers, if it be of conſideration leſs valuable then that which the law it ſelf required, which is the obedience of all mankind, or their everlaſting ſuffering for its tranſgreſſion. No Man or Creature but Chriſt alone could offer any ſuch ſatisfaction as this for us. And this he offered in the obedience or righteouſneſs of his whole life and death, as the price, ſacrifice, ranſome, propitiation for our ſins: which through the dignity of the Perſon that offered it, being the Son of God as well as man, was of value which is infinite. That which exceeds a thing or is more in value then it, cannot be the very thing it ſelf which in value it exceeds. The righteouſneſs then of Chriſt is really imputed to man, tendred in his behalf, and made ours in regard of this effect (or *in the end* to which it was intended I will ſay, when it cannot be ours *in it ſelf*), to wit, that God being ſatisfied or made no loſer in his juſtice hereby, does deal with us otherwiſe then by that law unto which at firſt we were created. If he deals not with us then according to that, it muſt be by ſome other, which hereby alſo is purchaſed; and that is according to his *grace* or *righteouſneſs* revealed in the Goſpel. This grace or righteouſneſs lyes in his acceptance of faith and repentance inſtead of perfect obedience for this righteouſneſs ſake of Chriſt thus imputed, and no otherwiſe then thus. When our Divines now ſay that there are no works of ours can ſtand before God in his diſtrict judgment, that they ſhould be *cauſa propter quam*, *the cauſe for which*, (that is for the merit ſake, or worthineſs whereof) he ſhould juſtifie any perſon, they ſay well; and there meaning is, that our works coming not up to the *original law*, God cannot for the performance of them, abſolve us as no ſinners: but yet ſeeing they are ſuch as anſwer the terms of the Goſpel, he does for Chriſts ſake, or his merits ſake, both pardon their imperfection, and impute them to us for righteouſneſs, in the accepting

ing them to life, or rewarding them with everlaſting ſalvation. In ſhort Chriſts righteouſneſs is imputed to us, but not for righteouſneſs. It is *for the righteouſneſs ſake*, but not formally though efficiently *by the righteouſneſs* of another, we are juſtified. It is not Chriſt, but our ſelves, that perform the new Covenant, and by the *new Covenant* is it, or by *grace*, that we are righteous in Gods ſight. It is not conſequently Chriſts ſufferings or obedience only, but our faith, obedience, ſincerity alſo, that is rewarded with ſalvation: yet is it not for the merit of this obedience of ours, but for his merits, or the merits of his righteouſneſs. Behold! this is the crittical hindge upon which the whole controverſie does turn. We will ſtand for the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs (*N. B.*) ſo far as ever we can with holding juſtification by the Covenant of grace: but when ſome Proteſtants have ſtood for it ſo, as renders our juſtification to be by the *law*, or the Covenant of works, and not by *grace*, they have departed from the Apoſtle. And thus the diſpute in the upſhot will I think end in this, that Chriſts righteouſneſs is the *meritorious*, indeed the *only meritorious*, or meritoriouſly *procuring efficient*, but muſt not be made the *formal* cauſe of mans juſtification.

And yet do I ſee there is need ſtill of ſome more words, ſeeing here the heart of all lyes. A righteouſneſs we muſt have if we be juſtified, and what is that righteouſneſs? There is a *legal* righteouſneſs: and *Evangelical* Chriſts righteouſneſs our Divines account our Legal righteouſneſs which muſt anſwer the law for us: and our faith and repentance muſt be produced to anſwer the Goſpel. The latter of theſe I take to be plain: the former muſt be warily underſtood. There is the *Precept*, and the *Retribution* of the law. We muſt take heed that we conceive not Chriſt to be our legal righteouſneſs in regard to the *Preceptive* part of the law (in the more frequent ſenſe), as if we were reputed by God to have fulfilled the ſame, or ſatisfied it in him as repreſenting our Perſons, which is the errour before confuted, and eſpecially by the reaſon laſt mentioned, becauſe this makes our juſtification to be by the law of *works*, (and not of *grace*) which ſubverts the Goſpel: but there is a righteouſneſs in regard to the *retributive* part of the law of works, conſiſting in our diſcharge from its curſe and penalty,

penalty, which is a *righteousneſs of pardon*, and if any will call this our *legal* righteousneſs (which is yet conferred by the *Goſpel*,) and account we have it in Chriſt, underſtanding nothing elſe by it, but that his righteousneſs is the meritorious cauſe of it, I know not any will oppoſe him. It is true, that *pardon* and *righteousneſs* without explication is a contradiction, and therefore when we allow of a *righteousneſs of pardon*, there is a *ſtrict* and a *large* ſenſe to be acknowledged of *terms* uſed in Scripture. Bleſſed is the man *unto whom God imputeth righteonſneſs without works*. The imputation of righteouſneſs to a perſon is to account him righteous; and for a man to be accounted righteous *without works*, that is without righteouſneſs, is explained in the next verſe, *viz.* to be *pardoned*. By *works*, he underſtands works of the *law* out of doubt, for without faith and repentance (or *Goſpel* works) God imputes righteouſneſs to none. Now how a man may be righteous according to the *law of grace*, and yet need pardon in reference to the *law of works*, the matter is plain: but to make a man *righteous* (through this pardon) in regard to the *retribution*, and *guilty* in regard to the *precept* of the ſame law, is to ſpeak I account *Scripturali licentia*, by leave of the Scripture. To be acquitted from the condemnation of a law by being pronounced innocent, or to be adjudged to the reward by being declared to have fulfilled it, is in the ſtrict ſenſe to be juſtified: To be acquitted from the condemnation, and be pronounced guilty, is to be *delivered* from the law, and not to be *juſtified*, but in a large ſence of juſtification. Juſtification *from* a law, and not *by* it, is a catechreſtical ſpeech, and I do queſtion whether we ſhould not (uſing a ſtrict ſpeaking) place the diſcharge of the ſinner from condemnation, upon the ſcore of Chriſts *redemption*, rather then on the work of our *juſtification*. That *God was in Chriſt reconciling the World to himſelf not imputing their treſpaſſes* does import an univerſal conditional remiſſion beſtowed upon all, ſo far as a delivery of the whole World over from the *law of works* to be judged by the *law of grace*; and when we are at that bar, there is no inqueſt like to be made about Chriſts work whether he hath done his part; but whether we have done ours, that is performed our condition, and if we be found to have bin upright to God in the

main

main bent of our hearts and lives, notwithſtanding our manifold failings, he accepts of us for Chriſts ſake, and declares us righteous according to this law: and ſo adjudges us to the reward or promiſe, which is to have Chriſt and his benefits, whereof one is the application of his redemption, and therein our diſcharge from the Laws condemnation. And thus methinks the Apoſtle ſpeaks with more acurateneſs, where juſtification and redemption are *de induſtria* diſtinguiſhed, and the one made the means or foundation to the other. *Being juſtified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Chriſt Jeſus.* Redemption is the delivery of the World in general from the law, and ſo from its penalty on terms appointed by the Redeemer: Juſtification is the pronouncing of particular perſons accepted upon thoſe terms, and ſo to have a right to the purchaſed poſſeſſion. In fine, there is but our own ſincerity, and a right to impunity and life, is all the righteouſneſs that we have, or that can go (in it ſelf) to the juſtification of a ſinner. The import of all is, we are not to conceive a ſinner to be brought before two barrs that he ſhould have need of a righteouſneſs of perfect obedience in Chriſt to plead againſt the law, for Chriſt hath redeemed us from coming before this barre, by the ranſome of his blood paid for all the World: but being to ſtand only at one bar, it is but one righteouſneſs is ſought as the condition upon which the ſentence muſt paſs, and as for that Righteouſneſs we have through Chriſt beſides, which is in regard only to the *retribution*, not the *work* of the law, that is to ſay Pardon, it comes to us by way of ſentence, or as a part of the reward given upon the condition performed, but is not part of the condition, or the whole condition it ſelf pleaded for our juſtification. Only the redemption of Chriſt, I count is to be firſt ſuppoſed, with the whole righteouſneſs of his Mediatorſhip, as the foundation, through the merits whereof, this new covenant is purchaſed, and ſo the reward given, for his ſake, upon that condition. And if it be for Chriſts ſake, for his merits, righteouſneſs, mediation, redemption ſake, we ſee alſo how this righteouſneſs of his, even his Mediatory righteouſneſs which cannot be ours poſſibly *in it ſelf*, is yet imputed to us and made ours in

the *effects*, or in the end to which it was performed, for salvation to Believers.

I will conclude all with the agreement of the two Apostles, which hath been already, but lightly, before touched.

When *Paul* then contends, that a man is not justified by the works of the law. By the works of the law, he means works as would justify him according to law if he had them, and sayes no man is justified hereby, because no man hath them, as he proves at large in the first and second Chapters to the *Romans*, as the very business and scope of both, to any that will consider of the matter, and so pleads a necessity of their *believing that they may be justified*. But when St. *James* sayes a man is justified by works, he means not works that answer the law, or such as of themselves would justifie the doer, which no man hath, neither *Abraham* himself, much less *Rahab* whom he also mentions, but such works as suppose grace to their acceptance through faith in the Redeemer, for the reconciling the Person, and covering his imperfections. And thus the two holy Penmen disagree not: but while the one saith, *I conclude a man is justified by faith without the works of the law*, and the other, *You see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only*, the sense of both is, that though a man hath not the works of the law (the works the law *qua fœdus* requires of him) which would justifie the doer if he did them (as for certain he does not, it being impossible for any to have these, so that if he be justifyed at all, he must be justified without them): yet is he justified by faith, provided that faith be accompanied with (or is the *initium* and *fundamentum* of) good works of another size; to wit, that will not make the reward to be of *debt*, but of *grace*, or that are unperfect and not able to justify him by law, yet are required in sincerity of life, together with his faith in the Redeemer (supposing him revealed, or else in the mercifulness of Gods nature) unto final justification, and salvation.

And now Reader, if thou art offended at this paper, I cannot help thy prejudice, but I desire thee to hear reason. If thou art sensible of that deadly advantage which is given to the Papists,

by

by our ill treating this point, by the doctrine I mean more particularly, of Chriſts righteouſneſs *imputed* in the unſound ſenſe, eſpecially when thoſe that expound it worſe, do ordinarily lay moſt ſtreſs upon it: If thou art ſenſible yet neerer home, what a ſtumbling block hereby hath been laid in the way of a late numerous Sect among us (whom to name methinks is ſome rudeneſs to them), that really having our Miniſters here by the lock (that is the place where their only ſtrength they have againſt us does lye), do reject the whole Tribe, as Falſe Teachers that harbour men in their ſins, and make Chriſt ſerve only to be a cover for them, as they bitterly traduce us, with great indignation, and in very earneſt on this account (which I muſt confeſs hath affected me ſo much in reading their books, as to ſet me to write, and gives me yet a good conſcience in what I do, though thou perhaps art angry with me for it): If laſtly thou art ſenſible of the evil and danger of *Libertiniſme* or *Antinomianiſme*, which hath been lately ſo rife, though now allayed in this Land, what roots yet it hath alive in this notion miſ-underſtood, thou wilt be adviſed with me, and others perhaps that ſee more then I, that it is time, that it is fit, this Sluce be ſtopt. The *Presbyterians* are my Friends, and the *Independents* my Friends, and Others my Friends, but Truth is greateſt, and muſt overcome.

Deo Gloria mihi condonatio.

JOHN HUMFREY.

ERRATA.

PAge 9. l. 35. *for juſtified them*, r. *juſtified by them. p.* 10. l. 28. *for that*, r. *ſeeing that* (N.B.) *p.* 19. l. 14. *for perceptive*, r. *preceptive.*

An Advertiſement.

THere is a *Book came out this Terme, entituled*, Two points of Moment Diſcuſſed, *by the ſame Authour: ſold by Mr.* Million *at the Bible in* Fleet-ſtreet.

THE
Middle-Way

In One paper of

THE COVENANTS, LAW and GOSPEL.

With Indifferency between the

LEGALIST & ANTINOMIAN.

By J. H.

Doing nothing by Partiality,

LONDON,

Printed for T. Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns in *Cheap-side*, 1674.

OF

The Covenants.

IT is one reaſon of my ſending out theſe ſheets thus in ſingle Papers, that I may have the opportunity my ſelf of Reflexion. If any thing be wanting I may ſupply it; where I am in the dark I may explain it, or call for Light; If I erre, I may correct it, and put my ſelf at eaſe ſtill when I need, as to the whole. It is verily a fooliſh thing I count for any man to think that he can ſpeak or write ſo, as what he hath once ſpoken or written cannot be mended. When we change our thoughts every day and week in our private Studies, what a vain reſolution is it, that becauſe we have Preached or Printed thus, the ſhutters muſt be drawen up preſently, and no more Light be let, to come in upon us. For my part I declare, I will never Preach or Print upon ſuch termes, but upon theſe: That I may be miſtaken; That I may acknowledg it, if I be convinced. That I may therefore be controuled, and have leave to be indifferent to my own opinion, as to anothers.

Two Papers I have ſent out already.

The first (or that which in order should be first) is of *Election and Redemption*, wherein I observe some things to be misplaced at the Press, but so long as the things be put in, and my notion proposed, I am sollicitous about nothing else. That God would have all to be saved, and therefore prepares that grace for all that is *sufficient*, which is his *antecedent will:* and that then he foresees who they be that will comply with that grace and and who not, and by his *consequent will* decrees the one to salvation, and the other to damnation, is that Doctrin in the maine, that is the *Rachel* of the *Schools*. For the latter part whereof, I have given my thoughts in that paper: the former part requires a little further consideration. That the goodness of God is advanced towards all, I like well, and that they lay the blame on man only that he perishes, and that they are so careful against *Pelagius*, for therefore do they bring in a *sufficient* grace for all, because man shall be allowed him to do nothing that disposes him to conversion or justification by his *own strength* without grace; nevertheless whether this *sufficient grace* of theirs is to pass or not, is the question. There is the *universal concourse of God* with man in all his acts as the first cause, *in whom we live and move and have our being:* and there is that influx or assistance of his, we call *Grace*. It would be known in the first place, what is the difference between these. That assistance of God which goes to the *acts of Nature*, and the preservation thereof, is the *common concourse of his Providence*, that assistance of his which goes to the production of acts *above Nature*, is called *Grace*. By Nature we mean corrupt Nature, and by acts above Nature we mean such acts as we should not do according to our natural inclination, if it were not for supernatural help, that is, some further operation or influence on us from God then that which goes only to our natural preservation. Grace then in short is that Divine assistance which *Elevates* Nature, and *heales* it. This Grace is twofold, the Divine motion, or habitual disposition; *habitualis gratia*, or *divina motio*; the infused habit, or Divine operation. It is said now in the Schools that there is this difference between *infused* habits, and *acquired*, that when the one do introduce only a *facility* to the action but presuppose the power, the other

other do bring the *power* it ſelf, as without which we *can do nothing*. This is ſpoken I count very agreeably to the Scripture, which ſets forth man in his natural ſtate as *dead in ſin*, and the work of Grace by *regeneration* and *new life*, with many the like expreſſions: nevertheleſs, as there muſt be ſome limits fixt for the right interpretation of ſuch places which in effect muſt come to that which I have given in my firſt paper, (that there is indeed ſuch an *indiſpoſition* on all men through original corruption, as that there is no man ever *does*, *did*, or *will* repent, do his duty, and *live*, but it is, was, and muſt be through Gods eſpecial Grace, and yet are we to account for all that, that they *have power*, that they *may* if they *will*, that the covenant of grace requires not any thing which is impoſſible, for both theſe are to be held): So muſt I crave liberty to enter my different opinion. It was *Pelagius* his conceit (*I have noted in one of my other papers*) that grace ſerved only to help the *power*, when St. *Auguſtine* proves that it *inclines the will*, and works in us the *deed*: my thoughts now lye partly between both, that the *Poſſe* or *Power* indeed is of *Nature*, and Grace or the operation of God is that which drawes that power into the Will, or *Act*, that is makes us willing; This act of the Will laies an impreſſion on the ſoul inclining it to the like acts; Theſe acts iterated turns that inclination to an habit, that is Habitual grace, *infuſed* if you pleaſe, *per modum acquiſitorum*. The *agere*, the act muſt preſuppoſe the *poſſe*, the *power*. That's certain. If the habit then brought the power, the *Divine motion*, or preventing grace which goes before the *habit*, did nothing. You will ſay, There is a double power, a *remote* or *next* power. The remote power is of nature, but the next power is of grace, and ſufficient grace gives to all a next power. Let me ask you then, whether there be any further grace after we have the next power, to make us willing, or to give us alſo the will and deed. If you grant it, you may make the moſt of your *ſufficient* grace, I will not quarrel with you for it: But when the *poſſe* (the *power*) is of nature, and the *Will* and *Deed* is of that grace which is more than *ſufficient*, I would faine know why nature and effectual grace alone ſhould not ſerve the turn, and

whether

whether ſufficient grace over and above theſe is not indeed more than needs? Here I ſtick where I left.

The ſecond paper is of *Juſtification*, and of this I count there are two parts. The one is, a *reconciliation of* St. *James* and *Paul*, and ſo of *faith* and *works* in that point: which I muſt needs ſay, having lain in my thoughts (& the main notion in Paper by me) this 16 or 18 Years or upwards, I cannot but be very throughly ſatisfied with, and much the rather, when I ſee the ſame growing up in late Books; as particularly in thoſe moſt judicious temperate *Theſes* of *Le Blanc*, and Mr. *Trumans Great Propitiation*. The other is concerning the *imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs*, wherein I will confeſs, though in my judgment I am perſwaded that what I have writ is the truth, and it is nothing but truth that made me write it: yet does my heart a little miſgive me, that it were better to let pious men alone to ſuch apprehenſions as they have imbibed, though mingled with much darkneſs and ſome errour, in ſuch a point as this, where ſo much of their peace and life is bound up, then to offer them any unſettlement by cleerer light, though I were able indeed to bring it to them. I may be allowed to be ſorry if I *offend* any body, but I ought to have a care I *ſtumble* none, who are good men and live godly; Neither would I ſtreighten my own ſoul. If there be any thing more therefore in the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs then I have expreſſed in that paper, which I know not, I doe not part with my portion in it, I proteſt thus much, but will rather renounce all upon the conviction to cleave to it.

That Chriſts righteouſneſs does juſtify us *from the Law*, and ſo from ſin, and from condemnation, I do hold no leſs then others: but that Chriſts righteouſneſs does juſtify us *by the Law*, is an overgrown conception. It is certain, that no works of man be we never ſo holy, are able to ſtand before God in his diſtrict judgment, that is, if he ſhould deal with us according to the exact juſtice of the Law without ſhewing us any mercy, which will be acknowledged by *Proteſtants* and *Papiſts*, who are ready to pray *both* with *David*, *Enter not into judgment with*

with thy ſervants O Lord, for in thy ſight ſhall no fleſh living be juſtified. If any *Papiſt* then ſhall think that mans righteouſneſs is made ſo perfect by Chriſts merits: or, any *Proteſtant* that Chriſts righteouſneſs it ſelf is ſo made ours, as that we are juſtified by the Law, upon that account, they are both miſtaken. This is the only true extreamity on both ſides: for it is not by the *Law*, but by *Faith*; by the *Evangelical* covenant, or by *Grace* that we are juſtified. *We are not under the Law*, ſayes the the Apoſtle, *but under grace*. It is enough for a poor ſinner to have a righteouſneſs imputed to him *without works*, and that he is pardoned: but to have a righteouſneſs imputed to him *with works*, is more then we can find to be allowed him. Chriſts righteouſneſs is ſuch, and to have that made ours *in it ſelf*, or ſo, as that in Gods reckoning we muſt be as righteous as he, I muſt needs ſay, it is not harder perhaps to believe that the bread is turned into Chriſts body (where we have a text for it) in the Sacrament: then to believe ſuch a conceit (for which we have no Scripture at all) in the matter of Juſtification. What then? Do I deny Imputation? No, but I explain it. It is by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, *not inherent in us*, our Divines will ſay Ordinarily, *but imputed to us*, that we are juſtified. And what if I thus interpret this for them, that is, not *as if we had done in his perſon what Chriſt did*, but by his righteouſneſs *made ours* in the *effects* only? So the very Learned Biſhop *Forbs* expreſly, *Hoc eſt, Quoad effectum & fructum* (See *Conſiderationes modeſtæ. De juſtificatione*, l. 2. c. 2.) I will uſe the ſame words as they uſe, but I am not bound to the ſame conſtruction. Even as I will ſpeak of mans inſufficiency (I mentioned before) as other Divines do, and as the Scriptures do, that *we can do nothing*: but I will keep the due interpretation. I will ſay we *can*, and that we *cannot*, without loſs of my liberty: for I muſt underſtand it with its right meaſure. I will ſay I *can* in confeſſion of my ſin, and acknowledging God juſt: I will ſay I *cannot* in the ſenſe of my corruption, and the imploring his grace.

Indeed a man can hardly conſider the Doctrin of St. *James* never ſo little with that of *Paul* which is on[illegible]art of my paper, but it will lead him to the other, which is to ſee that what

our

our Protestants say ordinarily on this matter, does need a favourable exposition. It is a jejune thing, I count, to bring the great dispute that *Paul* hath with the Jewes about justification to this result only, whether we are justified by *Faith*, or the proper *Work* or *Fruits* of it? It is but a little more satisfactory to bring it only to this, whether it be by the observation of *Moses* Law? For though this was the occasion of the dispute, and the Apostle therefore does shew them how it was by the *Promise*, and so by *Faith* that *Abraham* and the *Jewes* themselves had life, and not by the *Law*, which was but a *Schoolmaster* to lead them thereunto, or *unto Christ*: yet it is manifest, that he advances the point higher, while he tells them that by *Works* neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* could be justified, so that by *works* he must mean the observation of that *Law of works* which was common to both, and not *Moses* Law only: and the resolution of the dispute in both *Apostles* comes to this (as I have said) that it is by the performance of the covenant of *Grace*, and not of the covenant of *works*, or Law of *Moses*, that a man is to look for life everlasting. I must add, Nor are they to be heard in a third place, who say, that the dispute between *Paul* and the *Jewes* is neither of these, but whether we are justified by our own righteousnes, or by the righteousnes of Christ, and so resolve that it is not by any *works* which we do, even *Faith* it self as a *work*, but by the *works* Christ hath done for us, that is by the obedience of his life and death only. For though this be taught ordinarily by our *Protestants*, and is coincident with the first result, there is one thing I must say these *Divines* have not considered which I have offered them in my paper, that must bring them to another understanding. It is this, that the *Apostle* does indeed stand much upon the *Righteousnes of God* in opposition to *works*, in the busines of justification, but never opposes our *works* to the *Righteousnes of Christ*: the Righteousnes of Christ in their sense being truly a very contrary thing to the *Righteousnes of God* in the sense of the *Apostle*. The righteousnes of God according to the *Apostle*, if I may then describe it but as well as I can, and as the thing is, and a little more fully then I have in my former paper, is, on *God's part*, his taking our human frailty or false nature

nature into that meet conſideration, as not to deale with us in his *diſtrict judgment* which we cannot beare, but according to his *Covenant of Mercy:* the righteouſneſs, ſacrifice, attonement or ſatisfaction of Chriſt being ſuppoſed as the foundation upon which his Juſtice does ſtand good, notwithſtanding this condeſcention: And conſequently on *Mans part*, this righteouſneſs is our imperfect duty performed in ſincerity according to this *new Law*, and ſo for Chriſts ſake accepted to Salvation. In this ſenſe am I apt to underſtand that *everlaſting Righteouſneſs* which is *brought in*, by the Meſſiah, or by his covenant, in *Daniel:* and in this ſenſe do I conſtrue that Title, *The Lord our Righteouſneſs*. Only when I have ſaid in my former paper, *that it is not appropriated to the ſecond Perſon*, I deſire not to be ſo taken, as if I ſuppoſed that by the *Branch* in the two Texts of *Jeremy* where we find it, *Zerubabble* only was meant (though a total ſilence in the new Teſtament of ſo pertinent a quotation for Chriſt, if it were ſpoken of him, might well tempt *Grotius* to that interpretation) but that, the Divinity of Chriſt being thereby aſſerted, it is a *Title* that muſt belong to him as *God*, and not as *Second perſon*. For the Son is Lord, and the Father is Lord, and the Holy Ghoſt Lord: and yet not three Lords, but one Lord, *The Lord our Righteouſneſs*.

There is the *uncreated, abſolute* righteouſneſs of God, which is the Divine eſſence it ſelf, for as God is *Truth* in the abſtract. ſo is he *Righteouſneſs*: or the *created, relative* righteouſneſs of God, that is his righteouſneſs ſet forth in relation to us, which conſiſts in his dealing with us as his Creatures according to our conditions. This *relative* righteouſneſs then is double. The *Righteouſneſs* or *Juſtice* of God according to the Covenant of works: and the righteouſneſs or equity of God according to the Covenant of grace. The one I count to be that our Divines call his *Strict*: the other his *Paternal* Juſtice. When God made man at firſt and gave him the Law of his Creation, he was to deale with him according to this perfect Law, and it was but equal according to his perfect ſtate, and this being the original righteouſneſs (as I may ſay) of God in relation to us, there are none of us but do find ſome ſenſe of it in our hearts, that makes us not ſo much only to *fear*, as to be *afraid* of him

under that apprehenſion. But there is another *righteouſneſs* then this, which was ever afoot in the world ſince the promiſe of the *womans ſeed*, or elſe there were no man could have bin Saved, though it be ſaid to be now *manifeſted* (as *brought in*, in *Daniels* phraſe) becauſe the reaſon upon which it is founded, that is mans reconciliation to God by Chriſt, is revealed by the Goſpel, and this is the *righteouſneſs of God* oppoſed to *works* (or to his ſtrict Juſtice which he was bound to exerciſe according to the *Covenant of works*) that is ſo magnified by the Apoſtle. And here now is a diſtinction to be uſed which I want Termes to expreſs. For this righteouſneſs of God muſt be conſidered *with regard to himſelf*, which is his dealing with us according to the *Covenant of Faith* for Chriſts ſake, when he might deale with us according to the *Covenant of Nature* if he would: and *with regard to us*, or to the condition upon which he does ſo mercifully deale with us. As the *Love of God* is taken in Scripture both for his *Love towards us*, and our *Love of him*: So is the *Righteouſneſs of God* taken for both theſe, his dealing with us according to this covenant, and the condition on our part which he accepts. And hence is it, that when it is called the *Righteouſneſs of God* in one place, it is called the *Righteouſneſs of Faith* in another; and in a third, the *Righteouſneſs which is of God by Faith*. Now when it is our faith, our repentance, our new obedience which is the *Righteouſneſs of God* it ſelf (taken---help me to two Termes) whereby we are juſtified in oppoſition to the *works of the Law*, which no man can perform to be juſtified by them: and our Divines by *works* will underſtand all good works, even this faith it ſelf as a work (as was ſaid), and our Evangelical obedience, inſomuch as when there is no righteouſneſs but what is *without us* can be oppoſed to theſe, it makes them by the *Righteouſneſs of God* to underſtand the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* who is God, and by faith the righteouſneſs of Chriſt *apprehended by Faith*, which are in good earneſt conceptions ſo ſtrained: it appeares (if I may uſe thoſe words in humility) how *being ignorant of the Righteouſneſs of God* in the right notion, *and going about to eſtabliſh* in a contrary vein to the *Jews* a righteouſneſs which is not their *own* but anothers, in the ſtead of that which it is not,

they

they have not *ſubmitted* to the truth, in this Doctrin of Juſtification.

And herein now (farther) does appeare the ground of reconciliation between the Papiſts and us upon the point. For when the one and the other (let their Books be conſulted) do goe on the ſuppoſition that it is by the Law (the Law of works) that we are juſtified, this *Hypotheſis* being removed, the oppoſition on both ſides falls to the ground. That no man can bring or plead any ſuch righteouſneſs of his *own* before God as anſwers the Law, the Proteſtant muſt needs be in the right, and conſequently if it were by the Law that we muſt ſtand or fall at his Tribunal, there was a neceſſity for their bringing in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt made ours by faith (as they do) to juſtify us: but when indeed it is not ſo, when it is not (I ſay) by the *Law*, but by the *Covenant of Grace*, or by the *Goſpel* that we are to be judged, it is ſome wonder to me, this plain truth ſhould be no better underſtood. That Gods judging a man to have performed the condition of the covenant of grace is the accounting or declaring him righteous; and that Gods accounting a man righteous is his juſtification. *Let no man deceive you* (ſays St. *John*) *he that doth righteouſneſs, is righteous*. That righteouſneſs which makes a man righteous and denominates him righteous, is that righteouſneſs which makes God account him righteous. But this is the righteouſneſs which he *does*. Note it, for it is expreſs. And what righteouſneſs is that? Why, Not the righteouſneſs of *works* which no man *does*; but the righteouſneſs of the Goſpel, that is in the ſtile of the other Apoſtle, a righteouſneſs *without works* (to wit, without the works of the Law, or perfect works, in the ſenſe he ſayes alſo God juſtifies the *ungodly*) ſo that it is by *Grace*, while it it by this *Righteouſneſs* (which does and muſt lean on the merits of Chriſt no leſs then we ſay Faith it ſelf does) that we are juſtified and ſaved.

That the end of Chriſts coming into the world, of our redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, was that we ſhould be holy and righteous is ſaid ordinarily by Divines according to the Scriptures, but the right and plain underſtanding or reaſon of what they ſay, is not ſo ordinary. *He hath choſen us in*

Christ that we should be holy. He hath redeemed us from iniquity that we should be a peculiar People. We are his workmanship created unto good works in (or through) Christ Jesus. When God made man at first and gave him a Law, it was that he should live Holy. When righteousness then was the end of his *Creation* and the Law thereof, how is this said to be the end of his *Redemption*? I answer. Righteousness (or holiness as they are one) we must know, does lye in a conformity to the Law which God gives us. There is nothing else, and nothing less then this (the full performance of a Law given) that is Righteousness. Upon this account, as soon as man once fell and broke the Law of his creation, it was impossible he should be righteous any more, unless there were a new Law brought in, in the performance whereof he might attain to that again which he had lost. Now to this end was it, that Christ came and died, this was the very main business (*I count*) of his Redemption, even the procuring this new Law, or another Law with lower termes, which some men performing, they do thereby become righteous, and so have righteousness, according to that Law, imputed to them for remission, and life Eternal. Here you see what that righteousness indeed is which Christ is said to *bring in*, and in what sense he hath brought it in, or how such Texts (as those before) do attribute our Holiness to him. The obedience of Christs life and death, we know, was fulfilled on earth, and of this he himself hath once said, *It is finished*: But the righteousness he is said to *bring in*, is called an *Everlasting righteousness*. And what then can that be, but the *righteousness of the Gospel*, which upon the same account also is called the *Everlasting Gospel*? That is, because it is by *this* righteousness in opposition to that of the *Law* (or the righteousness of *works*) that all men from the beginning of the world to the end of it, (and so is it to be accounted ever of force) do obtain everlasting Salvation.

I know the great difficulty of this Doctrin will lye on the point of remission. Our Divines do generally place justification in the remission of Sin; so do the *Papists* (with something else), and so have I my self after others. Nevertheless, as I remember St. *Augustine* in one place does find *fault* with this

in

in *Pelagius*: ſo hath the perplexity of it of late lead me into the like thoughts. The truth is, Pardon of Sin is a *benefit* unto which the juſtified perſon is adjudged, as eternal life is: but remiſſion of Sin muſt not be made the *formal reaſon* of juſtification. Our Divines may define juſtification to be an Act of Grace whereby God gives us Eternal Life (or a right to it,) as well as, *an act of grace whereby he pardons our ſins.* That act, that very only act wherein the form of juſtification does lye, is Gods accounting or pronouncing a man righteous, and this is a forenſical act, according to Law, the Law, or Covenant of grace; Which covenant promiſing *Forgiveneſs* and *Life* upon the performance of its Conditions, when a man hath performed them, he hath a right to thoſe benefits, and when God does declare or account that a man hath performed them (which is all one as to judge him righteous), theſe benefits flow to him from that judgment (or are confer'd on him by that act) as *Effects* of that cauſe, and conſequently cannot be the very act it ſelf, which is the *cauſe* of them.

To forgive a mans ſin, and declare him righteous are two things inconſiſtent one with another in the ſame reſpect, and therefore when God pronounces a man juſt, it is according to the *Law of Faith*, and when he pardons his Sin, it is in reſpect to the *Law of works*. And how then can two acts incompatable but in divers reſpects (*cùm omne ens ſit unum*) be made to enter one and the ſame definition?

It is true as all agree, that there are no works that man does, or can doe, able to make God any amends for our offences, ſo that remiſſion of ſin muſt be attributed altogether to the merits of Chriſt in regard to the attonement made. But we muſt diſtinguiſh of Remiſſion, Remiſſion is either *Conditional* and *Univerſal* as it lyes in the Covenant, and is the purchaſe of Chriſt: or *Actual*, as it lyes in the application thereof to *particular* perſons upon performance of the condition. When Divines do ſay we can doe nothing our ſelves for procuring reconciliation and remiſſion, it is to be underſtood of Conditional univerſal remiſſion. No mortal could do any thing toward the obtaining of that. *God was in Chriſt reconciling the World unto himſelf not imputing their treſpaſſes.*

But

But as for remiſſion Actual, that man muſt be blind who ſees not that God does every where require us to repent, beleeve, confeſs our faults, forſake them, do good works, forgive others, that we may have pardon, and be ſaved. Conditional pardon now is *antecedent* to a mans juſtification, and contained in our redemption. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveneſs of Sins.* Actual remiſſion is *ſubſequent* to juſtification, for we muſt be ſuppoſed firſt to have performed the condition and be pronounced righteous, and then pardoned. When there is no remiſſion then but what does either *goe before*, or *follow* juſtification, it cannot be made the very act it ſelf of our juſtification.

There is one Text may be oppoſed. *Even as David alſo deſcribed the bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth Righteouſneſs without works. Saying, Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven.* It ſeems that the *Righteouſneſs* which Paul ſpeaks of *without works* in the one verſe, is deſcribed by *pardon* in the other. This I my ſelf have alleadged, but upon farther conſideration I anſwer. *The man to whom* God imputeth righteouſneſs without works, or the *bleſſedneſs* of *that* man, is deſcribed: but we may ſuppoſe, not *the Righteouſneſs without works*. The ſcope of the Apoſtle is plainly to ſhew us only, that it is not by *works of the Law*, or ſuch works as would make the *reward of debt* and not of *grace* (as appeares in the immediate verſes before) which are *perfect* works, that a man is juſtified. And he proves it by this argument, becauſe *the man is bleſſed whoſe ſins are forgiven*; that is as much as to ſay, not he who is without ſin, but he who hath ſin and it is forgiven. The man who is bleſſed is juſtified. But the man who is bleſſed hath ſin to be forgiven. Therefore the righteouſneſs which a man hath, or is imputed to him, is not a righteouſneſs according to the Law of works, but according to the Covenant of Grace. This I ſay is the ſcope of the place. Gods *imputing Righteouſneſs* to a perſon is indeed a phraſe ſignifying Gods accounting him righteous or juſtifying him: and the Apoſtle Proves a man is juſtified *without works*, (that is perfect works) becauſe he hath ſin to be covered. I will yet repeate, The man to whom righteouſneſs is imputed without works, is *pardoned*:

but

but it followes not, that this *Righteouſneſs without works* is *pardon*. To have righteouſneſs imputed to a man without works, is all one as to have faith imputed to him for righteouſneſs, ſo repentance or evangelical obedience, and that is not pardon, though theſe are never divided from the ſame ſubject. I will conclude therefore with that I have ſaid once before, & will ſay it again at my parting with the point, that it is ſtrange to me our Proteſtant Divines ſhould be ſo offward to this cleer Determination. To wit, God judges (and will judge) all men according to the Gospel; Thoſe who perform the condition of it, he accounts or pronounces righteous; They whom he accounts righteous, are juſtified. I will add, That, the righteouſneſs of *Chriſt* which is the *meritorious cauſe* of our juſtification without diſpute on all hands (that is the *impulſive procatartick cauſe*), which alwayes comes under the *Efficient*, cannot for the ſame reaſon be the *Formal*, or *Material* cauſe of it. It is not the *infuſion of Righteouſneſs* with the *Papiſt*, which is our ſanctification; nor the *imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs* with the *Proteſtant*, which is not to be underſtood but *in genere cauſæ Efficientis*; nor *remiſſion of Sin*, with Proteſtant and Papiſt, which I have now bin diſproving: but the imputing to a perſon his performance of the new covenant for righteouſneſs, or the accounting or pronouncing him righteous according to that covenant, is the *form*, formal Cauſe, or *formal Reaſon* of his juſtification.

Do not think this ſtrange, Juſtification (I will grant) *virtually* or *Eminenter* (as *unum aggregatione*) containes in it many things, and ſo *remiſſion* among others (for we muſt find line to ſpeak as Divines uſe): but Juſtification *Formaliter* (as *unum ſimplex*) I ſay, is only Gods pronouncing us *Juſt* (or ſincere penitent believers), and *remiſſion* is a *benefit* which *in order of Nature* does *follow* the performance of that condition.

And ſo I proceed to my third Paper, Of the Covenants, Of the Law and Goſpel.

For the Doctrin of the *Covenants*. There is the Covenant of *Works* (ſay Divines): and the Covenant of *Grace*. The Covenant of works (ſay they) was made with *Adam* in his

in

integrity being that Law which is written in all mens hearts, and ſo requires perfection, and for the leaſt tranſgreſſion threatens Death. The Covenant of grace is made with man in his Eſtate fallen (or with Chriſt in his behalf), and requires only our Faith, repentance, and ſincerity, unto Life, which being held forth under the Title of the *Promiſe* to *Adam*, *Abraham*, *David*, and all during the Law, was ratified by the death and blood of Chriſt the Redeemer under the Goſpel, and ſo promulgated to the world, to continue ſtill on force (and in that, as in one regard, called *new*) as long as that laſts. *Behold the dayes come ſaith the Lord when I will make a new Covenant, not according to the Covenant I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt.* Here is the *Old* Covenant and the *New* Covenant. The Old is that which God made with the Jews when *Moſes* lead them in the wilderneſs. The New is that which we have under the Goſpel. The old Covenant then is not the Covenant of *works*; for that was made with all in *Adam*, and as written in our hearts, muſt be eternally obligatory. But the old Covenant was made with the *Jews* in oppoſition to other Nations, and as peculiar to them is vaniſhed, and binds not. Neither is it the Covenant of *grace* for the ſame reaſon, as alſo becauſe the covenant of grace is the new covenant, but the New is not the Old. The Old and New covenants ſay Divines indeed ordinarily, are both the covenant of grace in oppoſition to that of works, the ſame in *ſubſtance*, but differing in the *Adminiſtration*. But this with me is not ſo eaſy to be received without the diſtinction of an *A* and *The* in the caſe. The Old covenant may be a covenant of grace, or covenant of works, or both, but not the covenant of works, or the covenant of grace. There are ſome plead it is a *ſubſervient* covenant as *Camero*. Some that it is a *mixt* covenant as *Ball*. Some that it is a covenant of *works* as the *Leyden* Divines. The moſt of our own late Divines, do make it a covenant of grace. Whereof one voluminous Authour denying the other three opinions, does yet ſay it was ſo diſpenſed as to tender life both upon the condition of Faith, and works. But if it propoſed life on condition of perfect doing, it was a covenant of works: If on

be

believing too, a Covenant mixt both of Works and Grace: And as perfect doing was urged only in tendency to believing, a Covenant-Subservient; and so all say true as to the main; and yet none so distinctly true, as to leave any enquiring man without confusion in what they say. There is one thing then *I* apprehend will serve much for the enodation of many difficulties in theis matter, and that is to conceive aright what the Old Covenant is: And there is another like it to the same purpose, to know what kind of Covenant it was.

As for the former, we have hitherto been seeing but what it is *not* only; now to understand what it *is*, Let us separate what *Moses* did deliver to the *Israelites*, from that which was before in promise to the *Patriarks* as single by it self, and this is the Old Covenant. Or, take that, and all that whatsoever, and in what manner soever, that was *added* to the Covenant of Grace, which *Abraham* and the *Patriarks* were under, and that abstracted therefrom, is *I* count, the Old Covenant. Let me yet speak more fully; Take *Abraham* before he was ninety years old, when he at first Believed, and that Faith was imputed to him for Righteousness, upon which he became the Father of the faithful, while as yet he was in his Uncircumcision (for the Law of Circumcision which was after given in peculiar reference to his natural Seed the Jews, in pursuance of the temporal Benediction, is to be reckoned as Preambulatory to the Law, and belonging to it), and when you have pared away Circumcision, and all that which *Moses* commanded the Jews afterwards, from *Walk before me* only, *and be perfect*; all this rest, this pared away from that, whatsoever it be, is *I* say, the Old Covenant, or the *Law* strictly taken. From this in the first place, we have light to distinguish between the Law taken *strictly* and *largely*: In regard whereof, we shall find the Apostles somtimes proving the *Righteousness of Faith* from the Law, being *witnessed by the Law and the Prophets*; and another time setting the Law and Gospel at the widest distance and opposition. As the Law is taken *comprehensively* for the promise to *Abraham*, as well as the Covenant made with the Jews (that is for the whole state they stood in, who were under the Law, by vertue of the Covenant confirm'd to their fore-Fa-

thers, as by vertue of that given by *Moſes*), the Law and Goſpel are confounded. As the Law is taken *ſtrictly* or *preciſely* for the Old Covenant, or the Law of *Moſes* with Circumciſion its appurtenance, that is for all that apart that was *added* to the promiſe before-going, and abſtracted there-from as *I* have ſaid, ſo are they diſtinguiſhed, and their differences to be owned and maintained. In the next place, we may underſtand from this, how the Jews were under both conditions of Believing and Doing: Of *doing this and live*; and of *believing* alſo *that they might be ſaved*. To wit, As the Covenant of Grace was delivered to their fore-Fathers, and ſo on foot before, it muſt needs hold forth life to them on their Faith, as well as to *Abraham* their Progenitour, who received Circumciſion as a Seal of *Righteouſneſs* thereby (or to come thereby), and not by the Law, which as yet was not given. And as the Law was *added* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) to this Covenant or Promiſe, it did tye the Jews to a performance of it as a condition of *living* by it, in ſome ſenſe, as neither the Patriarks before, nor we ſince are under; and in regard whereof that which is ſaid by a reverend perſon, that the *Old Teſtament-Spirit* was a *fearing Spirit*, with the like expreſſions, are not without a truth in them, that deſires more conſideration then *One* of late does give them: Eſpecially when the Apoſtle is ſo expreſs that the Jews were under a *School-Maſter*, and we are not under that School-Maſter, That the Covenant from *Sinai engendred to Bondage*; but where the Spirit of the Lord is, or the New Teſtament is, there is *Liberty*. From this yet in the third place, we may enlarge our light further, to judge of that abrogation of the Law, or deliverance from it, which Chriſtians have under the Goſpel. A glorious thing (the Apoſtle counts it), that puts us directly into ſuch an eſtate and condition as the Patriarks, and thoſe holy men before *Abraham* were in, to live according to the light and liberty of their Conſciences, that is according to the Law of Nature, which as it is in the hands of *Chriſt*, and not of *Moſes*, to wit, as delivered from the Yoke of his Ceremonies, and the ſuperſtition of Idolaters, and adminiſtred with *Grace* and the *Spirit*, with *Grace* in God's acceptation of our ſincerity inſtead of perfect obedience for the Redeemers ſake, and with the

Spirit

Spirit in his assistance of us for the performance, is both the Universal Religion of Man-kind, and the substance of that which is Christian unto this day. I should quote *Eusebius, De prep. Evan.* See his *Eccl. Hist. l.* 1. *c.* 5. From whence also, we see in the way, how the Covenant of Grace which *Abraham* and all those holy men which went before him, or that ever were, have had as well as we, is yet called the New Covenant; and that is, it is called New, as the lump is called a *new lump* by the Apostle to the *Corinths*. That Church was leavened by the ill example of vicious Members, particularly of the incestuous person, they are therefore commanded to cast him out, and that they should not mingle themselves, or keep company with the scandalous, and in so doing, they should become, as it were, a new body, or lump, though they were still otherwise but the same Community. *Purge out therefore the old Leaven, that you may be a new Lump.* So is it with the Covenant, it was made by God with all man-kind in Christ, ever since the beginning of the World, and confirmed to the Patriarchs (it being impossible else that any should have been saved), and yet it is called a New Covenant in relation to us under the Gospel; because I say that, that which was *added* to it by *Moses*, to wit, all that which properly is the Old Covenant, is removed or purged away, as the Leaven in the *Jews* Feast, by Christ our Pass-over, who hath been Sacrificed, and made for us that expurgation. *And if that which is done away was glorious, how much more that which remains?* That which is done away, was the Ministration of death engraven in stone, and of the Letter that killeth: That which remaineth, is the Ministration of the New Testament, of the Spirit which giveth Life, and of Righteousness. *That which remaineth*, I pray note it, That cannot be said to *remain* which was not before extant. The Covenant of Grace with the Patriarchs, and the New Covenant with us, being the very same, as I have said, but ours only called *New*, (or renewed) upon the abolishing of that which was super-added, as upon this remaining too it self, never to wax old and vanish.

For the latter, what kind of Covenant I take this to be, I am now in order to tell you. The Old Covenant, as to me it seemeth, was a kind of Political Covenant made with the Nation of

the *Jews*, as Princes compacts are with their people, when they firſt ſet up Government. God promiſes them his Protection, that he would lead them to a fruitful Land; overcome all their Enemies, with the like bleſſings; and they promiſe him they will be ruled by him. To this purpoſe did God in ſundry ways appear to them to *Moſes*, to their Elders, to them all in the Clouds and Fire; and then cauſes a Tabernacle to be made for him, which was a Keeping houſe among them, where the Sacrifices and Offerings was his Proviſion, and the Prieſts his Servants that lived on him; and unto that Tabernacle and Ark, might they repair for Counſel and Judgment. This People then being peculiarly under a Theocracy, which *Samuel* in two places does expreſly ſignify (at leaſt until the time of *Saul*), ſo that the Church and Common-wealth of the *Jews* were but one, according to the Apoſtle; it is no wonder if Religion be made their Laws, and ſo required of them, together with other political Ordinances and Statutes, for their happineſs or publick peace as a Nation. From hence is it, that though their Law is not to be judged the Covenant of Works, or the Covenant of Grace, either of the two themſelves, yet may we expect that it ſhould *repreſent* both the one and the other to them; becauſe in the knowledge of both does the buſineſs of Religion, and the whole of it, virtually conſiſt. In the delivery of the Moral Law, and that with Thunder and Lightning, and ſuch Terrour as we read of it, they had a repreſentation of the Covenant of Nature, which *quafactus* is doubtleſs in our falne Eſtate a Miniſtration only of Wrath, or Law of ſin and death. In their Ceremonial Offerings, and Prieſtly appointments, though there was a remembrance ſtill of ſin, and ſo matter of bondage and fear, yet had they types of Chriſt, of remedying Mercy, and the Glory to come. Theſe Sacrifices were brought directly as Mulcts to their King, to deliver them from the danger of preſent puniſhment, being Redemptions of their lives, which elſe they ſhould have forfeited by his Laws, and ſerved, I have ſaid, to the *maintenance of his houſe*, the Tabernacle and Temple which he was pleaſed to *keep* up among them: Nevertheleſs that does not hinder, but God Almighty might make uſe thereof, farther, for types and repreſentations of other things, *that*

is

is to say Spiritual, and so the Law be a *Pædagogy* under a *temporal* diſpenſation, leading many to *Heaven*. This is certain, that the Covenants of *Nature* & *Grace* being made with *Man-kind*, are not matters of concernment only to the *Jews*, but to the whole world as well as to them for everlaſting life and death; and it is not to be conceived, therefore, that either of them ſhould receive any detriment by the Covenant made with that particular Nation. *This, I ſay, that the Covenant confirmed before of God in Chriſt, the Law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot diſannul, that it ſhould make the Promiſe of no effect.* The Covenant of God in Chriſt, is the covenant of grace, and that we ſee a-foot in the world before the Law, and before *Abraham*; for, when it was *confirmed* to *Abraham*, it muſt be in being before on neceſſity, and ever was ſince the Fall, or elſe none after could be ſaved. And if this be not diſannul'd, then cannot that, whatſoever it be, which is given by this covenant, come to the *Jews* by the Law. For as the Apoſtle argues, *If there had been a Law given that could have given life, verily Righteouſneſs ſhould have been by the Law*; If the Law of Nature could be kept by man, there would be no need of a covenant of Grace by Chriſt: So do I argue, if Righteouſneſs unto juſtification of life, was to come by the Law, the Promiſe, or Covenant of Grace, as ſoon as that was given, might be ſpared. But for-as-much as eternal life and juſtification does come only by the covenant of grace, it follows that the covenant made with the *Jews*, muſt needs be a covenant which concern'd their outward ſtate, or political welfare, as I have ſaid; and that neither Salvation nor Condemnation, as to the life to come, was the primary intention, or the direct and proper effect of it.

If Salvation, or Condemnation was the proper iſſue of the Law, then could neither any of thoſe holy men as the Patriarchs, nor any of the wicked world, who were before the Law, as the men of *Sodom* and *Gomorah* be condemned at the day of Judgment: For where no Law is, there is no Tranſgreſſion, and ſo no Condemnation. And indeed, if this covenant was conceived any other than ſome ſuch thing as I make it, how could it be, that the moſt ſubſtantial part, or body of the *Jews*

Nation ſhould be *Sadducees* in Chriſt's time? The Covenant of Nature is that which lays all the world guilty before God; ſo that *He who believes not, is Condemned already*; he is condemned by the Law of his Creation writ in his heart; he needs no outward Law to condemne him *Whatſoever things the Law ſaith, it ſaith to them who are under the Law*: If there were no Curſe, nor Death, but that which the *Jews* Law doth ſpeak, then were there none but the *Jew* ſhould ſuffer Condemnation. If a man on the contrary ſide does believe and repent, he needs no other *Law* than that of the *ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus*, to *ſet him free from* this Law *of Sin and Death*. So long as he does not believe, he *abides* under that *Wrath*, and it is not for want of Faith as the *cauſe of his Condemnation* (to juſtify God in not giving all men that alike), but for want of it (*N B*), as that which ſhould be the *remedy*, that he periſhes. Salvation then, and Condemnation which is Eternall, does proceed from the covenants of grace and works; and it is not to be imagined that God ſhould deal otherwiſe with the *Jews* than with the reſt of the world, as to the terms of a future life. *I have ſet before you Life and Death*, ſays *Moſes*. And *Curſed be he that continueth not in all the Law to do it*. But what this *Life* and *Death*, theſe *Bleſſings* and *Curſes* are, we ſee expreſs in *Deuteronomy*, and in the fifth Commandement. The Laws which God did give the *Jews*, were about *Religion*, and about *Civil* matters. Religion concern'd their Eternal, civil things their Temporal good. Yet whether they are commanded the obſervation of the one or the other, the ſanction of both does lye in the threats and promiſes of Temporal bleſſings and judgments. Even as in the Laws of our Realm, Religion and the Service of God is required under a civil forfeiture, when it is the Goſpel it ſelf muſt threaten farther Vengeance to the Tranſgreſſor. In ſhort, herein will lye the miſtery and ſum of all. The Law, as it was in the hand of *Moſes*, and given to the peculiar Nation of the *Jews*, muſt be no other than a temporal covenant, yet did this temporal covenant contain in it *patterns of things* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) *in the Heavens*. And as the ten Commandements particularly, written in ſtone, are a tranſcript of the Moral Law written by Nature in our hearts, I do take the Law to *repreſent* the covenant

nant of works, and by vertue of that repreſentation alone, or of that it repreſents, does it operate to future judgment, and is the miniſtration of condemnation. The Law indeed, taken at large, for all that is contained in the whole books of the Old Teſtament, may be ſuppoſed to hold forth whatſoever is in the covenant of works and grace: but the Law taken ſeparately from both, as a third covenant, cannot hold forth any other than the external government of God with propriety over the *Jews*, and that conſiſting in theſe two things, to wit, a hard task of burdenſome dutyes under the danger of temporal judgments, and a redreſs from them by Sacrifices; the one typifying our eſtate according to the Law of works; and the other, the grace which comes to us by Chriſt Jeſus.

What uſe may be made of this, I leave to minds which are ſearching. I am never out of my way I count, ſo long as I meet with any ſuch. Only there is *one* in a late Book, who ſeems to fall a little too hard on a grave Preacher for making the diſpenſation of the Old Teſtament, in ſome Sermons of his, to be more terrible than ours under the New: For doing which he hath thus much the more reaſon indeed, if (as I ſay) that life and death which is Eternal, comes not from the *Law*, but from the *Covenants* of *Works* and *Grace*, which were before it, and cannot be made voyd by it. There is therefore the *Believing Penitent* Sinner, and the *Unbelieving and Impenitent*. For the man that ſins and repents not, it is true that he hath no leſs reaſon to fear under the Goſpel than under the Law; but rather the more, in regard that the threatnings of the Law were directly, I take it only of temporal puniſhments, but the Goſpel does manifeſtly threaten Eternal. *Of how much ſorer punniſhment* (ſays the Scripture) *worthy he is?* But for the Penitent and Believing, the caſe is otherwiſe, and the *Reprover* ſhould know it is in regard of ſuch, that this difference is to be holden. It is true then, the Penitent *Jew* had the Promiſe to truſt to as well as we, but yet he was ſtill under the Law, and not we: and the Law it ſelf did engender to bondage, as in the Scripture before quoted. He had the *Promiſe* as well as we, but he could not *look unto it* as well as we, he had a *vail* over him as we have not, that he could not *ſtedfaſtly look unto the end of that*

which

which was abolished. This is most apparent that the *Jews* were in the dark as to their understanding of the covenant, and Christ that End, after another manner than we are, and the more they were in the dark, the more must they be in doubts and fears, and upon this foundation is this difference built ordinarily, I suppose, by the Understanding. Nevertheless, there is yet this one thing or two farther, that under the Law, there was recourse to be had still unto their Sacrifices, which were *remembrances of sin*, I said before, and consequently of terrour and bondage, seeing if they failed, they had reason of fear in regard of temporal punishments, as much more then we, as they had to expect temporal blessings more then we upon their obedience, upon the account they were under a peculiar temral covenant. Adde hereunto, These temporal things under that covenant were resemblances, patterns, and in some sence portendments of future. *To what end then served the Law*, says the Apostle, as you may likewise adjoyn from this supposition? *It was added because of Transgressions, The Law entred that the offence might abound.* Again, *By the Law comes the knowledg of sin*; and though sin was in the world before, men were not apt to impute it to themselves without a Law. The Law then was for the brideling the *Jews* from sin, and through the conviction of sin upon the Conscience, and that temporal death they saw due to them in the Beasts that were slain in their behalfs, they might be driven in the sence of their spiritual estates, to the remedying Law of Mercy upon Repentance, which is the substance of the Promise which God had given to their fore-Fathers, and has established in the Gospel. *For Christ was the end of the Law for Righteousness; and the Law was a Schoolmaster* (says the Apostle) *to drive us to Christ.*

For

Of the Law *and* Goſpel.

FOr this Theam, I ſhall have need to ſpeak the leſs in regard of what hath been ſaid already. That which I have to offer, I ſhall ſerve in by way of ſtriking light at a paſſage or two in a Book which hath been *intended* in the Chapter before, but not *named*. I am ſenſible how many there are, who being taken with the Preaching of *free grace*, are too apt to diſrelliſh other Preachers, who preſs more unto *Duty*; and I think that Writer does not therefore ſpend his pains without good cauſe about the conſiſtency of good works with the Goſpel and Juſtification. It is objected againſt ſuch Divines, that they are but Legal Preachers, and that they impeach the grace of God by putting men ſo much on Doing. To the one his Anſwer is, *They Preach not the Works of* Moſes *Law, but the Works Chriſt enjoyns:* To the other he tells us, *The Law and Goſpel both put us upon doing, but not the ſame thing, nor with the ſame diſpoſition*, which he explains; *The Goſpel gives better rules of life, and power to do according to them, with a more willing and chearful mind than the Law did.* I will here under favour of this ingenious perſon, uſe a few words.

For the firſt, I look not on this Anſwer ſo jejunely, as if the meaning of the Authour was only that they preach not the *Ceremonial* Law; for who need be inform'd of that, or that the ceremonial Law does no longer oblige? But ſuppoſing the Moral Law it ſelf coming under a double conſideration, to wit, as delivered by *Moſes*, and as it is in the hand of *Chriſt*; it is this indeed which is worth his enquiry, how the dutyes of the ten Commandements, or thoſe good works which we, as well as the *Jews* are bound to perform, are obligatory in the one reſpect, and not in the other. Now ſhould he have uſed theſe words, as ſome of our Divines do, and by the diſtinction intend only, we are not obliged to good works in the point of Juſtification, but out of gratitude to our Redeemer, or to that purpoſe, he muſt run ſtreight into that *premunire* which he ſtrives to avoid, to wit, of Juſtification by Faith only. If he

ſtick upon this, that the Law, as it was in the hand of *Moſes*, was given for a temporal covenant, and not ſo as it is in the hand of *Chriſt*, I do not ſee what that does ſignify to the objection. This is that therefore which is to be ſaid, and to be conceived therefore what he intends. By the works of the Law, underſtand we, that exact obedience which is required unto living by the Law, *Do this and live*. By the works Chriſt enjoyns, let us underſtand that ſincerity only in our obedience which God requires unto our *living by Faith*, or accepts though imperfect through Chriſt. Good works are not exacted now of any in the *firſt* ſence, but good works are required of all in the *ſecond*. That Preacher that ſhould Preach obedience to the decalogue, as neceſſary to life in the former ſence, were a *legal* Preacher indeed; but that Preacher that preaches obedience and good works in the ſecond ſence, is but a Preacher of the *Goſpel*, and may not preach otherwiſe, as he tenders his Hearers Salvation. *And behold, one came to Chriſt, and ſaid, what ſhall I do that I may inherit Eternal Life? And he ſaid to him, if thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandements.* The Commandements then, I ſay, may be conſidered as the *matter* of the covenant of works, or our *Legal* Righteouſneſs: or as the *matter* of the covenant of grace, or our *Evangelical* Righteouſneſs. In the former ſence, if any man could perform them, he ſhould merit Eternal Life, and be ſure to have it; but there is no man can keep them as they are ſo required. In the latter ſence, there is no man but muſt keep them (as to the prevalent intereſt of his will, which conſtitutes integrity), and does, that ever was, and is finally juſtified and ſaved.

For the ſecond, we have two or three things to be touched: In the firſt place, I do not believe (craving that Gentlemans pardon) that the Goſpel gives any *better*, or any other rules of life, than what are contained in the Law. It is true that Chriſt hath inſtituted other Sacraments, but it is the Moral Law we call the rule of life, and that Chriſt came not to bring us the Syſteme of any new Law, but to explain and eſtabliſh the Law Moral (which the *Jews*, I count, and *Gentiles* both ever had, the one by the light of Nature, the other by Revelation alſo) is a truth ſomthing more conſiderable, as I take it, than that a-

lone which our Divines contend for againſt the *Socinian* in this *matter*. In the next place, when Divines make a difference between the Law and Goſpel, as to the power of doing, that the Law *commands to do*, but the Goſpel *gives power to do*; The Law commands the tale of *Brick*, but gives not *Straw*, and the like expreſſions: I doubt not, but they have ſome verity at the bottom, which ſhould have nakedly been laid down, if he could, by this Bright perſon, For the delivery of things after others, by roat, without diſgeſtion, is the great fault which he finds ſo often in other mens Books. The *Law* and *Goſpel* we know are liable to a diverſe acception. By the *Law* moſt properly, I think, we are to underſtand that Law which is written in the heart of man by Nature, in *Adams* and ours, the copy whereof, is the ten Commandements, called the Moral Law: and by the Goſpel, the Law of Chriſt; That which he delivered, and his Apoſtles. The matter whereof in both, may be conſidered *qua fœdus*, or *qua regula*, to uſe the terms of others. *Qua regula*, the things required in the Law moral, and the Goſpel or Law of Chriſt, are the ſame: but *qua fœdus*, the Law of Nature originally requires theſe things in *perfection*, to be accepted unto life; and the Law of Chriſt requires them in *ſincerity* only, accepting them, though imperfect unto life, through his Mediation and Redemption. This is the only difference that concerns us here between the Law and the Goſpel. The Law then and Goſpel both being conſidered as the Doctrin of life, how does this Authour ſpeak, that the *one* gives power, and not the *other*? The rule ſhews what we are to do; the power to do, is not given by our being ſhown. That which therefore is to be underſtood by ſuch terms, may come to this; that, that which the Law thus taken (that is the Law of our Creation, and *quâ fœdus*) does require of man, is not in our power to do, and conſequently none can attain Salvation by it: but that which the Goſpel requires, we have power to perform; and if we be not wanting to God's Grace, upon the performance we ſhall be ſaved. In the third place, when he ſays the Goſpel enables us to do with a more willing and chearful mind then the Law; if we underſtand this kind of ſpeech, as thoſe Divines do I think ordinarily that uſe it, in ſuch a ſence, that Chriſt ha-

ving done all our works for us, that Righteouſneſs of his which was a moſt perfect conformity to the Law, being imputed, or accepted in our behalf for life, there are no good works now required of us to do, but only as the teſtification of our thankfulneſs, and belief of this, and therefore we perform all we do with gladneſs, joy, and love altogether, without bondage, fear, or doubt, it being not in order to our Juſtification, though we miſcarry in the doing: I do apprehend this Learned Man would be one of the firſt to diſlike ſuch Teaching. Yet is there thus much here of truth alſo, That when the Law (ſo taken as before) does give us no heart at all to do that which *through the fleſh* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) is indeed *impoſſible* to any, the Goſpel does give us encouragement to do, upon the account, that what it requires may be performed, and by that performance (through the aſſiſtance of God's Spirit) as the condition, Man is both juſtified and ſaved.

I know well that St. *Auguſtine* does uſe the like expreſſions, and I think often, but he does explain his meaning, which comes to this; that when the *Law of works* commands us what is our duty, and threatens us if we do it not, the *Law of Faith* (he counts) directs us to God for his aſſiſtance, grace, or ſpirit, to do what he commands. I do not forget neither, that God hath promiſed his ſpirit, and ſo his grace for the performance of the New Covenant; and though it does not follow, that if *Adam* had ſtood, he ſhould not therefore have given man his grace and ſpirit for performing the *perfect* obedience of the Old, as well as to us for the performing *imperfect* under the New, ſeeing that Father does ſpeak of *grace* to *Adam*, as to us; and if we ſhould aſcribe the obedience he performed, during his Innocency to his own ſtrength, and not to the adjutory of God's ſpirit altogether, he would not endure it: Yet if the Authour, or thoſe Divines of ours that ſpeak as he does, will chooſe rather to make good what they ſay upon the contrary aſſertion, then can I tell how to underſtand with them. When God made Man at firſt, we know, he endued him with original righteouſneſs. Let us ſuppoſe this righteouſneſs alone, ſufficient to him for the performing the Law, unto which he was made; ſo that before the fall, there was no need of that we call *grace*

(which

(which is properly ſuch help of the ſpirit, as conſiſts in the healing and relief of our falne eſtate) to enable man to do that which he had ſtrength to perform by *nature*, until he did voluntarily deflect from it. But when he was fallen, and loſt that righteouſneſs, which was his ſtrength, then are we to conceive a need ſtreight, both of a new Law, to be lowerd, brought down, or fitted to his weakneſs, that he may be *able*; and alſo of grace, that he may be made *willing* to perform it. And thus ſhall there be grace, the ſpirit, and the promiſe of it belonging to the Covenant of our Redeemer, when there was none, nor need of it, to belong to the covenant of our Creation. However, there is this I count moſt certain, and I would have it to be noted, that the ſpirit which is promiſed or given to man for his obedience to God, is promiſed and given only in reſpect to *this Covenant*, not for the performance of the *Covenant of Nature*, for then ſhould *Adam* never have falne, nor we have had any need of a Redeemer.

It is true, that there are ſome Divines are ſo much (with *Auſtin*) to have *Adams* ſtanding (ſuppoſing he had ſtood) to be of grace, that they will have mans original righteouſneſs to be a work (or habit) *ſupernatural*, from which, when *Adam* fell, he returned, (as they would teach us) to his *pure naturals*, and ſo his Poſterity are born. But this is a kind of Pelagianiſme, no ways to be received: For what indeed ſhould be a Creatures *Nature*, if that be not, which it receives from its *Creation*: Beſides, if mans original righteouſneſs be not lookt on as *natural*, how ſhall original ſin, which conſiſts in the loſs of it, be defined by the *depravation* of our *nature*, according to the doctrin of the Church of *England*, as well as the Catechiſme of the Aſſembly? Neither is Dr. *Taylor* here to be heard, who cannot abide that, that (whatſoever he will call it) which we contract from *Adam* without any will of our own, ſhould be held to be ſin, or ſo much as damnable, though it ſhould be granted him through Chriſt's redemption actually to damn no body. It may be the want of a plainer conſideration, what the immediate benefit of Chriſt's redemption to the world, is, made that excellent perſon think this ſo grievous. It is not grievous, I hope, that God ſhould give a Law to his Creature according

to his nature; and that therefore having made man righteous, he ſhould require of him to continue in that righteouſneſs, and walk up according to it. It neceſſarily follows without any thing elſe, that this Law being made in Innocency, muſt condemne all man-kind, in whom this righteouſneſs and perfection is no longer to be found; ſo that by nature, or according to this Covenant of mans nature, we are, and muſt be all the Children of wrath, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks. It would now be indeed a grievous thing if God ſhould deal with any in that juſtice, as he might according to this Covenant; and therefore it hath pleaſed him according to *a Righteouſneſs of his* declared in the Goſpel, in oppoſition to the righteouſneſs of this Covenant of works, to give us his Son; who by the work of his Mediation for man-kind, ſhould prepare a remedying Law, or univerſal conditional remiſſion againſt that condemnation. As for Children then, if they are Baptized, we are to account they do perform this Covenant, or new Law, by the Faith of their Parents bringing them to Baptiſme. *This is my Covenant you ſhall keep, every man-child ſhall be Circumciſed.* If they be not Baptiſed, we are yet to look on them as ſuch who have not broken this new Law, or never refuſed and rejected their remedy; and ſo long as by the Redemption of Chriſt, they are delivered over with all the world from the Covenant of works, to the new Law to be judged. I will not be the man that ſhall condemn one Infant to Hell, or unto torments; although, if there be any that will make a difference of place, or ſtate in the future life for Children, proportionable only to the difference there is between performing the condition, and not being guilty of any breach at all of it, I will not gain-ſay them, nor determine any thing in a matter ſo lubricous, and above what is written.

To return; By the Law and the Goſpel, it may be thought perhaps by ſome, that we are to underſtand the ſtate of the Old and New Teſtament; and ſo muſt this Authour mentioned be made to conceive that *David*, and the like holy men, had not the ſame ſpirit or power, or not ſo much, to enable them to obſerve God's precepts, as we have now, when he uſes theſe expreſſions. That the ſpirit was given under the Goſpel as to his miraculous gifts in another meaſure, then under the Law. I be-

believe; and that such Texts as *the spirit was not yet given, because Christ was not yet glorified,* and that, *they had not yet heard that there was a Holy Ghost*, with the like, may be happily so understood, I believe: But to think that the Spirit, as to sanctification of the heart, and inclining it to a ready service of God, was not given under the Old Testament as well as under the the New, is a conceit I will not fasten on any. To say it is given more to us now, than to *David*, *Samuel*, *Jeremy*, and such persons in respect to this end, will yet require explanation and proof, if that be intended wholly by these speeches.

Before I pass, there is one passage of this apt Writer, I cannot but note with much approbation. *It is Grace that accepts of our Repentance, and Obedience after we have sinned.* This passage contains more in it, then the most are like to be aware of. The Scripture tells us in several Texts, that by Grace we are saved, & freely justified, and not by Works. By Works we are to understand the works of the Law, and that *quâ fadas*, as before; and no body is justified or saved by these works, they being above the ability of any to perform. By Grace, *I* will understand with him this accepting our sincere, though imperfect obedience for life through Christ, as if it were perfect righteousness. *Not unto him that worketh*, that is, unto him that hath not performed the works of the Law, which if they were perfect, he should live by them: *but unto him that believeth on him that justifies the ungodly*, that is, but is ungodly in reference to these works, or is one that his Conscience tells him, hath sinned, and does sin, or is imperfect, and falls short of these works, yet believes that God is gracious and merciful for all that, and will pardon these sins and failings, if he repent and walk sincerely, though imperfectly, *his Faith is imputed for Righteousness*; his *Faith*, that is such a believing this, as produces that repentance and sincere walking, is *imputed to him for Righteousness*; that is, is made to stand him in that stead as a perfect righteousness would do; so that through grace, or this gracious acceptance, he shall live by it. There are works (if *I* may still say over, what hath been somwhere also said before) that would make life to be of debt according to God's Covenant of Nature, if any could perform them, and so there are none justified or saved by works, for *all*

have

have sinned and fall short (under this sence) *of the glory of God*: Or there are works that cannot be accepted or imputed unto life, but through grace; and so is it, that by grace only, or *gratis*, that the Scripture teaches us we are justified and saved. Nay, the acceptance of our imperfect, sincere obedience for righteousness, or that we should live by it, is that very grace it self that saves us. So well am I pleased with this Note from that Authour.

If this seem to savour too much of inculcation, you must pardon me. I do apprehend that the Doctrin of grace and justification, whereof I have been, and therefore am still the longer, hath been the occasion of several apprehensions in good men, that instead of being *conducive* to, have proved but *hinderances* of, true sober practical Godliness. There are two of these mentioned by the same understanding person.

The one is a conceit, that a Christian may not avoyd sin, and do good, for fear of Hell, and to obtain Heaven, that is for the sake of Reward. This the Mentioner hath confuted with plain Text, that it needs not a second hand: Onely, that it may not needlesly disquiet any, I will advance this contrary truth; that whatsoever person, out of any principle, fear, or hope, or love, does, or shall in the prevalent intentions of his Soul, and endeavour as to the constant tenour of his life, prefer his Eternal Salvation before his Flesh-pleasing in this world, is surely in a good Estate, the Converted man, or the Godly man, that shall be saved. *He that does Righteousness is born of God.* I will suppose him a Christian, and one that acts according to the Scripture; but if he be a Heathen, and acts herein but fully up to his light, I dare not deny the same of him. And indeed, what is that pure love of God, out of which you will say alone, a man must act? *If you love me*, says Christ, who knows best, *keep my Commandements.* The love of God, and keeping his Commandments are the same. The commands of God are to be kept that we may inherit Eternal Life, Christ tells the Ruler in the Gospel expres (I have noted before), and consequently we may love God to that end. If man could do any good to God, by his duties, or any hurt by his sins, then should I believe there was some other end of our duty, than man's Salvation.

tion. You may ſay, this appears ſelfiſh, or ſelf-love only. I anſwer that, that man then, who does but love himſelf ſo as to ſeek the Salvation of his Soul above his fleſh, this world, and any thing therein, is the man he ſhould be in the ſight of God. If you ſtick at it, conſider, what is Salvation? A loving God, a delighting in him, a conformity to him. I love God in keeping his Commandements in this life, that I may be conformed to him, and have complacency in him to all Eternity. I will adde, our Orthodox Divines ſay not (and are not to be ſo underſtood) that good works may not be done with reſpect to the reward; but with reſpect to the reward, as due to them *ex condigno*. For to expect that God ſhould accept of what we do, in bearing with our failings, and rewarding us *out of Grace*; when we walk ſincerely before him, is but to act our Faith on, or putting our truſt in, his declared goodneſs, Chriſts Merits, and the promiſes of the Goſpel.

The other Apprehenſion is, that a Chriſtian muſt not *live on his own Purſe or Earnings*. A pretty ſound of ſomthing, which (as I ſuppoſe) does ſignify that which other Divines intend by *Reſting in Duty*. There is therefore a reſting in *Duty*, I may ſay, and a reſting on *God in Duty*. I doubt not but a Chriſtian is to truſt to God for whatſoever he ſeeks of him upon the performance of his duty, when it were but preſumption to do ſo without that performance. It is true, that no man, by any thing he can do (ſeeing when he hath done all, he is but an unprofitable Servant) can deſerve or merit any thing from God's hand (and much leſs his ſaving Grace, which is moſt free) ſo as it may be properly ſaid to be earned, as wages is due unto work, or to make his bleſſings of debt; yet is a Chriſtian by his prayers, and the like duty, ſaid to get, or obtain from God whatſoever he hath from him; and as a man does live on his Eſtate which he gets, ſo may a Chriſtian be ſaid to live his ſpiritual life, upon the riches of God's grace which he gets by his duty. The want of truſting to duty therefore, in a right ſenſe, is indeed, I doubt me, more reprovable in our Proteſtants ordinarily than their reſting in duty. And I am ſeriouſly troubled very often, at what I have obſerved in ſome of our ſpecial practical Divines about this point of reſting in du-

ties (I will particularly name *Mr. Shepheards ſincere Converſe*), which is enough to bring any man Religiouſly melancholly (for the more pious his Soul is in the caſe, the more liable it muſt be to ſuch ſtroaks) into deſperation. I will, therefore, ſay thus much in zeal againſt that danger. Let a man be but careful of two things about *reſting* in duty, and trouble himſelf henceforth no more, but about the *doing* of it. The firſt is, Let him take heed of making any duty a pillow to lay his head on to reſt in ſin. Thus it is dangerous indeed to reſt in duty; and this may be either when a man thinks he may ſin, and go on in it, becauſe he Prays, gives Almes, or the like; as if that would bear him out: Or chiefly, when a man ſhall ſit down ſhort of ſincere Converſion, by doing of ſome duty, that is by taking up in leaving ſome ſins, and doing many things he did not before, he ſhall content himſelf, and not come up to that univerſal unreſerved, giving up himſelf to Chriſt, as is required of him to that ſincerity of life, which is the condition of Salvation. This is the moſt deadly, dangerous reſting in duty that I will admoniſh every Soul of. And then for the ſecond, I will ſay only, Let him be a Proteſtant, which I count he is, and I doubt not but his opinion alone againſt merit, and that he is juſtified through Chriſt, will ſecure him for the reſt of this buſineſs. Provided though, he remembers ſtill that humility, and the like qualification of Soul, when he hath done all he can do, is alſo his duty.

And now after I have ſpoken of theſe Heads, if any be otherwiſe minded in whatſoever I have hitherto ſaid, and are reſolved to keep to that only which they count the ſoundeſt *Calviniſme* in them all, I will be ſo candid, as to lay down their doctrin for them, to the beſt advantage. God hath Elected ſome to Salvation. Chriſt dyed only for them. That which he hath Purchaſed by his Death, is not only the benefit conditionally, but Faith it ſelf the condition. Faith is the perſwaſion of a man, that Chriſt hath died particularly for him, and ſo his ſins are forgiven. This perſwaſion, or apprehenſion of Chriſt, makes Chriſt ones own, and ſo juſtifies inſtrumentally, without works, either Legal or Evangelical. and how alſo to ſerve this turn, I have ſet down in my paper of Juſtification, *page* 15. No

man

man can be ever, in good earneſt, thus perſwaded, but the Elect, for whom alone this Faith is purchaſed. When a Miniſter then declares the Goſpel, and requires of all in God's name to Believe, to wit, to believe particularly that Chriſt hath dyed for their ſins, as knowing not, for his part, who the Elect by name be, there is no fear of hurt unto any, ſeeing no perſon on earth ſhall be able to be perſwaded hereof indeed (that perſwaſion, with *Calvin* and *Luther*, being true Faith), but the Elect only. Beſides, as ſoon as this perſwaſion once is but wrought, it does ſo poſſeſs the Soul with love and gratitude to the Redeemer, that it conſtrains it to Chriſtian duty; ſo that unfained Converſion, Self-denyal, a Crucifixion with Chriſt to the world and the fleſh, and the life of God, and that with perſeverance to the end, do follow as naturally (to wit, according to the *new Nature*) as the Fig-tree brings forth Figgs, or the Olive, Olives, without all poſſibility of ſeparation from it. This Doctrin, if any will ſo concatenate the parts, does ſeem to me to carry a kind of myſterious authority in it, that I find ſome awe for it at my heart, although really, I am convinced both of the danger of it, and alſo (excepting only in the firſt propoſition) that it is untrue. So far am I from deſpiſing of thoſe, againſt whom the ſpirit of that Authour, in the book intimated, ſeems ſo much over-ſharpened: when yet I do encline in my own ſentiments to hang things together, much rather after his faſhion, than theirs, who would look upon me as more Evangelical, in ſuch a Determination.

Deo Gloria mihi Condonatio.

J. H.

ERRATA.

PAge 16. l. 21. for *deſires* read *deſerves*. p. 18. l. 7. for *Clouds* read *Cloud*.

THE
Middle-Way.
OF
PERFECTION.

With Indifferency between

The ORTHODOX
AND THE
QUAKER.

By J.H.

Doing nothing by Partiality,

LONDON,
Printed for T. Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns in *Cheap-side*, 1674.

Of *Perfection.*

PErfection is one of the Doctrines of the Quaker, that there is *a ſtate of perfect ſeparation from ſin* in this life; That it is not onely poſſible for a man to keep the whole Law of God, but that every true Chriſtian doth attain it; That the work of Chriſts Redemption does conſiſt in this to bring men up to ſuch a ſtate, to be free not onely in regard of the *guilt*, but the *inhabitaton* of ſin, ſo that it is not indeed ſo much pardoned, as aboliſhed. There are no mean Doctors in the Schools have gone before them and taught us, that though there remain that which is *fomes peccati* (to uſe *Auguſtines* expreſſion); yet not that which is *peccatum* in the regenerate after Baptiſme, and conſequently the righteouſneſs which they through Chriſt (or grace) perform (the Quaker chooſes to call it Chriſts Righteouſneſs) being perfect, does not onely conſtitute them juſt in the ſight of God, but enables them to ſtand before the Throne of Gods juſtice, and ſo juſtifyes them and ſaves them. They now who are read here in the Controverſies between us and the Papiſts, may gueſs how far theſe friends are like to be ſupported; and that they are not therefore to be put off, as ſome think, with ſleighting and contempt onely. For my part, I will confeſs it is not the deſigne of theſe Papers to endeavour ſo much a refutation of any Party, as to build up others in that Truth which Errour on all ſides leanes upon. *Omne falſum innititur vero.* And as the beſt Phyſitians have been noted ſometimes to take

very great regard to the ordinary receipts of old women and the meaneſt perſons: ſo will it become the modeſt Divine, to endeavour rather to *diſcover* and ſift out that Truth which lies in his Adverſaries meaning, then to *expoſe*, and ſhame their Opinions.

Before I come to my preſent ſubject, it is neceſſary that I ſet a *little* out of my way, which may elſe engender diſpute, in my laſt paper. It is about pardon of ſin, which I take to be the *effect*, not *formal Reaſon* of juſtification. *Pardon* (ſayes Mr. Bradſhaw) *is neither the whole, nor any eſſential part of juſtification, but onely a contingent effect of it.* Treat. of Juſt. c. 8. That a man muſt repent and believe (which is to perform the condition of the Covenant of Grace), in order of nature, before he be pardoned, is out of queſtion. That God accounts the perſon a performer who is ſo, ariſes of neceſſity, becauſe his judgment is alwayes according to Truth. Now when Gods accounting a man Righteous according to the Covenant (which is all one with his accounting him a penitent Believer, or performer of the condition) is *juſtifying* him as I ſay there, and pardon followes this, it appeared to me that Remiſſion muſt not be the *form* it ſelf, or *part*, but the *effect* of juſtification. And it is true remiſſion is the effect, and no part of *this* juſtification: But there may be ſome *other* or further juſtification then this. To avoyd needleſs difference therefore with Brethren, I muſt diſtinguiſh juſtification. Juſtification we agree to be a forenſical act oppoſed to the laying any thing to a mans charge whereby he may be condemned. *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It is God that juſtifieth.* Now there is a double charge, the charge of the *Law*, that we are ſinners, and ſo condemnable for violation of it: And the charge of the *Goſpel* that we have not performed the remedying condition which God requires of us for the eſcaping that condemnation. Though it be an acquittal of us from the *latter* charge is that juſtification which every man is ſo much concerned to provide for, as that which depends upon the plea of what himſelf does, and the acquittal of us from the *former*, depends onely on the plea of what Chriſt hath done for us, which can hardly ſuffer any debate I think before our Judge: yet

yet will I not deny but juſtification may be taken ſo *comprehenſively* as to contain in it our diſcharge from the *Law* alſo There is a juſtification then in regard to a *particular* charge, the charge of the *one*: or a *univerſal* juſtification againſt all accuſation, or the charge of *both*. As we muſt anſwer the charge of the Goſpel by denying that charge, and pleading our performance: we anſwer the charge of the Law by confeſſing it, and pleading Chriſts ſatisfaction; that is we acknowledge that we areguilty and have deſerved Death, but yet that we are not condemnable becauſe we are pardoned by the Law of Grace, through the Meritorious Righteouſneſs and Sacrifice of Chriſt Jeſus, ſuppoſing ſuch a Charge can find place before our Law-giver. Our Faith and Repentance is our Righteouſneſs in regard to the Goſpel: but pardon of ſin, together with this righteouſneſs, may go both into *Vniverſal* juſtification. I cannot indeed but ſay ſtill, that that juſtification which is *particular* in regard to the Goſpel Charge, ſeemes to me to be the juſtification which St. *Paul* and *James* mainly intend, if not altogether; for when the one ſayes we are *juſtified by Faith*, and the other *by works alſo*, and both prove it from one and the ſame Text, that *Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs*: I pray what elſe can juſtification be with either, but Gods imputing evangelical obedience to a perſon for Righteouſneſs, that is Gods accounting of him righteous upon his believeing repenting, or performing the condition of the Goſpel? That the Apoſtles *Righteouſneſs without Works*, and *Pardon*, is not the ſame (and conſquently that the one is a probation and not a deſcription of the other as I noted upon reflection), muſt be granted by thoſe who make both theſe to be parts of our juſtification, for ſuch is the nature of parts to be diverſe one from another. *Hac eſt natura partium ut unum corpus diverſa componant.* Boethius. de Conſ. l. 3. p. 3. Again *Quod a qualibet re diverſum eſt, id non eſt illud a quo intelligitur diverſum.* It muſt be alſo confeſſed by me, that the diverſity of *two* things, as the cauſe and effect, does not hinder thoſe things to be parts of another *third* which is the *compoſitum* of both: and conſquently that Gods juſtifiying us by this *Righteouſneſs* (that is by *Faith* or Evangelical Obedi-

ence, *without the Works of the Law*), and then pardoning us, as the effect of that act, may both make up the *compoſitum* of *Univerſal* juſtification. You ſee how tender I am of perſiſting in any miſtake, wherein I have or may prejudice others. I doe not find that the Scripture does denominate or pronounce any one *righteous* or *a juſt Man* from one end to the other, upon any other account then his *doing Righteouſneſs*, yet will I not quarrel with any that ſay, we are made righteous alſo by forgiveneſs; and that the delivery of us from ſin, from the Law, and condemnation by it, is *Juſtification*: Though really I am apt to think, that this work is to be attributed rather with the Apoſtle, to our *Redemption*. Compare *Epheſ.* 1. 7. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *Rom.* 3. 24. with other places. And ſo I come to my point, of *Perfection*. Onely I muſt adde this Corollary. *Simpliciſſimum nobis videtur ſi dicamus, fidem juſtificare, quia credenti ſua fides imputetur ad juſtitiam. Fides autem ad juſtitiam imputari dicitur, quia Deus illum qui viva fide in Chriſtum credit pro juſto habet & reputat, eum a pœna peccati liberans, & ad vitam æternam acceptans, propter Chriſti mortem & obedientiam.*

It is to be acknowledged, that there are, and may be very many Scriptures eaſily preſſed by the Quaker and Papiſt for the ſervice of their Doctrine, ſo that there is no doubt but thus much is proved; that it is our duty to be as *perfect* as they would have. Every ſin is forbidden, and every good thing that is ſo by the Law of innocency, is commanded. But it is one thing to know what is our duty, and another what will be accepted of God in our performance. Our duty is one thing, and what we can, or doe attain to, another. God brings not his *ſcales* under the Covenant of Grace, that our works ſhould have their full weight, but his *touchſtone* expecting they be right, that they proceed onely from a ſincere heart, and then he accepts them upon the merits of Chriſt Jeſus. Nay indeed the *Duty* of the Goſpel is one thing, and the *Condition* of it another.

The words *perfect* and *perfection* in ſeveral places of Scripture, may receive an interpretation according to the purpoſe unto which they are applied. *As many as are perfect, let us be*

thus

thus minded. By perfection there, I apprehend ſuch a degree of knowledge, as the *ſtrong* Chriſtian is ſuppoſed to have otherwhere in oppoſition to the *weake*, who underſtanding not their liberty by the Goſpel were ſcandalized about indifferent things, and ſo could not walk up to the ſame rule. *Not that I had already attained* (ſayes the ſame Apoſtle hard by) *or were already perfect.* In the one verſe of the ſame Chapter he is perfect, in the other he is not; wherein yet there is no more real difficulty then this, that a man may in *one thing* be ſaid to be perfect, who in *another* is imperfect, which *Auguſtine* ſhewes in the fifteenth chapter of his ſecond book, *De peccatorum meritis & remiſſione.*

Indeed that Father in that book and in another, *De ſpiritu & littera,* hath the luck to treat induſtriouſly on this matter. *Alia eſt quæſtio* (ſayes he) *utrum eſſe poſſit homo in hac vita ſine peccato: alia utrum ſit? It is one queſtion, whether it be poſſible for a man to attain to ſuch perfection as to live without ſin? and another, whether there be any that doe?* For the former queſtion, he diſtinguiſhes of what is poſſible by *Grace*: And what is poſſible by our *own Strength.* To hold, that any man by his free will onely without grace is able to keep all Gods commandements and be without ſin, is that grand Pelagian Doctrine againſt which he ſets his face, and deteſts it: But that it is poſſible to attaine this by *grace*, or the ſpecial aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit, he thinks it beſt (it ſeemes) to grant. He thinks it not fit, not ſafe, to ſay any (or all) of Gods Commandements are impoſſible. Beſides, where God vouchſafes his grace, the work (he pleads) is to be aſcribed to him unto whom *nothing is impoſſible.* For the ſecond queſtion, whether there is or ever was any man upon earth (Chriſt onely excepted) that does, or did attain hereunto (how great a meaſure of grace ſoever it be which he has or had), he is peremtory in the denyal, as full in his proof from Scripture, there being ſeveral things (he ſayes) which are *poſſible*, and yet never ſhall *be* in the World.

There is no doubt now but in the diſpute between the Quaker and us the terme *perfection* is underſtood alike. It is a perfection they hold in reference to the whole life, that a man ſins

not. And if any in the dispute do carry the matter so high against them, as to deny what they contend for, to be *possible*, they may if they please choose more wariness from St. *Austine*, for the Quaker ascribes not to themselves, but to the *Spirit*, the *life*, the *power*, or to *Christ within*, all that they doe. On the contrary side, if these Friends will not be content with what is allowed them, that our duty reaches so far as not to sin at all (and consequently to be perfect as the Saints in Heaven, that is, to be in our kind as God in his, is perfect), and that it be not denied (when we cannot grant) that this our whole duty is *possible* through that spirit by which I hope some of them are lead: but they will go on further to say, that themselves are such as *have attained*, and that every one who does not attain to the same pitch, to wit, to live without sin, cannot be in a state of Grace and Salvation, I shall think it time to send them, if they be learned, to the same Father and Books, for their reproof and satisfaction. As for my thoughts farther of this *impossibility*, and what distinction is here wanting, you may see (p. 12. & 19.) in my first paper of *Election*.

It is common indeed for the Scripture to speak of men and women as perfect. *Mark the perfect Man.* Noah was a *perfect man.* Job a *perfect man.* The good Kings are said to walk before God with a *perfect heart*, when yet their failings are recorded in the same chapter. It is less wonder, to have our duty set forth in this manner. *Thou shalt be perfect with thy Lord thy God.* Let us *go on unto perfection.* Walk before me and *be perfect.* Thou shalt love the Lord with *all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy strength.* Thy Will be done in Earth as it is done *in Heaven.* Be followers of Christ. And as *his* was, so must our *conversation be in the world.* There is no man hath a sensible knowledge of himself, but he perceives dayly how far his *duty* is above his *performance.* I am not ignorant neither, how some Texts may be drawn out of their sence, where the place must give them a right construction. *By one Offering* (sayes the Apostle) *Christ hath perfected them that are sanctified:* But we are not to conceive that at *once* therefore he perfects mans sanctification. I deny not moreover, but the end of Christs manifestation in the flesh, was to *redeem us from iniquity*, to

destroy

deſtroy the Works of the Devil, to reſtore us out of ſin and unrighteouſneſs, and *preſent us unto God*, as a *peculiar People*, *Purified by Faith*, *Zealous of good Works*, *Holy and without blame*, *Entire and wanting nothing*, *Perfect and compleat in all the Will of God*. I will not cite here thoſe abundance of Texts which are at my pens end, leaſt it ſhould engage me to a particular diſcourſe concerning them. It will ſuffice in the general that we diſtinguiſh of the *time*, and of the *perfection* which is to be underſtood in ſuch ſeveral places.

I do remember when the Donatiſts are pleading, many of the ſame and the like Scriptures for their Church and ſeparation, this is one anſwer the Orthodox offer them. There are *duo tempora Eccleſiæ* (ſay they) *quæ nunc eſt: & qualis erit. Illa divina Teſtimonia quibus commendatur eccleſia cum malorum commixtione hoc tempus ejus ſignificat qualis eſt in præſenti ſæculo: & illa teſtimonia quibus commendatur non habere commixtos malos, illud ejus tempus, qualis venturo ſæculo in æternum futura eſt! See Breviculi collationum cum Donatiſtis.* I ſhall ſay the ſame here. There are two Times or States of the Church. The ſtate of this *preſent life*, and the ſtate of the *life to come*. We doubt not but Chriſt hath purchaſed for his Church and People ſuch a ſtate as is to be without ſin, as well as without miſery: But this ſtate which is *compleating* alway, muſt not be expected to be *compleated* till the other life. When Chriſt ſhall preſent her to his Father, a *glorious* Church then ſhall ſhe be, without *ſpot or wrinkle, or any ſuch thing*: but while ſhe is but a *gracious Church*, that is, while ſhe is in this life, ſhe ſhall not be without her wrinkles nor her troubles. We ſhall reconcile the Scripture very well, if when it ſets forth every man as a ſinner, that ſtands in need of remiſſion every day, we refer ſuch Texts as ſpeak indeed of perfect freedom, unto the ſtate of the life to come.

In the firſt place then, there is *perfectio viæ, or patriæ; viatorum*, or *comprehenſorum*, to uſe the terms of the Schools. A perfection belonging to the ſtate while we are in the way, as travellours: or a perfection belonging to the ſtate when we ſhall get home, or to our Countrey, or to ſuch as have *already attained*, in St. *Pauls* terms. I hope the Quaker that diſputes

with us about *Perfection*, will acknowledge a difference in regard of attainment between the two estates of *Grace* and *Glory*. And if that *perfection* which consists in a freedom from all sin does remain for the Rest above, I see not who the man is, that can free himself from all *sinful imperfection*, in this World. *I press forward* (says the Apostle) *if by any meanes I might attain unto the Resurrection of the Dead*. Such a Perfection belike as that *in Heaven* is his duty, but he can by no meanes here *attaine* unto it.

In the next place then, that *Perfection* which belongs to the state of this Life is to be considered in the *kind*, and in the *degrees* of it. There is a Perfection of the *kind*: and of the *degree*. I do not find any of these friends in their writings do take Perfection for a *superlative* Word; They acknowledge *degrees* in their Perfecton, that one hath more of the light and life then another. There are *Fathers, young Men, and Children* in Grace, as St. *John* speaks. The Child hath a perfection of parts, that is, hath all its Members, as well as the growen man, but not at the same maturity. Now I would faine know of the judicious among this sect two things in my way. The one, whether that degree of Holiness which is attained by any man, is not the duty of every man? The other, whether he that fails in the least of what is his Duty, does not sin? The rule is but one to all: and sin is any want of conformity to that Rule. However in this, we may both come to an accord. They will yeild to us, that there is a perfection of *degree* which they have not attained, or that there are more degrees still to be sought, so long as they expect another state above in Glory: And we do not deny to them that perfection in its *kind*, which every man (we hold as well as they) does, and must attaine unto, that is saved. The great difficulty will be onely in a right understanding of what *kind* of perfection it is, which is to be agreed upon by both.

In the way for the nnderstanding whereof, I must lay down this note, that when the Scripture speaks of any good man or woman that *fears God*, or walk *righteously*; it is all one in Holy Language as the being *Perfect* is. *Noah* is said to be a just Man and *perfect* and one that walked with God. *Job* a man

man perfect and upright, and one that feared God and eſchewed evil. To be a juſt Man then, a righteous man, a man that fears God, is in Scripture to be a perfect man: and to be a perfect man is to be a juſt man, a righteous man, one that fears God and eſchews evil. They are terms I ſay æquivalent in Scripture account. *Bleſſed is the Man that walketh not in the Council of the ungodly, nor ſtandeth in the way of Sinners.* The man that walketh not in the Council or way of the wicked, is *the perfect man*, in other places of the Pſalmes. It is a full deſcription, that we have of *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*. *They were both Righteous before God, walking in all the commandements and ordinances of the Lord blameleſs.* Now if theſe friends will be contented with ſuch a Perfection in its *kind* as was in *Noah*, in *Job*, in *Jacob*, in *Abraham*, in the good Kings, the Prophets, in the Church of Corinth (1 *Cor.* 2. 6.) Coloſſe. (*Col.* 1. 28.), in *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*, and is indeed in every man and woman once Converted, differing nevertheleſs in *degree* one above another, then ſhall we and they in the end be lead to a perfect accomodation.

There is in the laſt place therefore, a double *kind* of that Perfection which belongs to the ſtate of this life. A Perfection according to the *covenant of Nature*: and a perfection according to the *Covenant of Grace*. When God made his Creatures, he appointed an order for them, in reference to which they are all ſaid to obey the Law of their Creation. Man being endued with a reaſonable Soul muſt have the knowledge of this Law, ſo far as concerns his part in it, and conſequently his reaſon alone could direct him every thing whatſoever (except of poſitive inſtitution) he was to do in order to that end unto which he was Created. Upon this does ariſe the Law of Nature, which when he was to obſerve as the condition of his Happineſs and Gods favour, or the continuance of both, that law muſt be alſo a Covenant, and that is the Covenant of Nature or Works. This Covenant being broken, and we rendred too impotent for it, it pleaſed God for Chriſts ſake to vouchſafe another, wherein he propoſes his favour and life upon lower Terms as is ſuitable to our falen ſtate. Now as a conformity to the Covenant of *Nature* is mans Righteouſneſs, and when there is no flaw therein his

Perfection according to *that* Covenant: ſo a conformity to the terms of *Grace* is our righteouſneſs according to *this* Covenant; and when there is nothing wanting in our coming up fully to thoſe terms (as if there be, it will not ſerve our turn), it muſt be our perfection. And here then is that Perfection upon which we are to be reconciled. Not a perfection which conſiſts in doing every thing in the Earth we are bound to do: but a perfection that notwithſtanding our many failings, is not wanting in coming up to the Terms which God accepts for Righteouſneſs to everlaſting Salvation, in the Covenant of the Goſpel. There is a *Righteouſneſs of God* declared or ſet forth under the new Teſtament in oppoſition to *Works* (which I have mentioned in my Paper of *Juſtification*, and explained to my content in my laſt paper of the *Covenants*), and it is according to this Righteouſneſs, the World is to know, that the Scripture ſpeaks (N B), when it makes *Noah*, *Job*, *Daniel*, *Zachary* or any other, juſt men, righteous men, and perfect men in the ſight of God: When elſe, there is no *fleſh* before the infinite Holineſs that is *clean*, or that could be juſtified and ſtand in judgment.

Hear O Houſe of Iſrael, is not my wayes equal? When the wicked turneth from his wickedneſs and doeth that which is lawful and right he ſhall ſave his Soul. This is ſaid to be equal with God. *If we confeſs our ſins, he is faithful and juſt to forgive us our ſins and cleanſe us from all unrighteouſneſs.* Not onely merciful, but juſt. In like manner, *God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love which ye have ſhewn towards his Name.* Again, *it is a righteous thing with God to recompence to you who are troubled reſt when Chriſt ſhall be revealed from Heaven.* Henceforth there is laid up for me *a Crown of Righteouſneſs which the Righteous God ſhall give me.* If God, it ſeemes, from ſuch Scriptures as theſe, ſhould put no difference between the penitent ſinner and others, he would not be righteous according to that righteouſneſs which is aſcribed to him in theſe and the like places, although if he ſhould deſtroy the world for one tranſgreſſion, we could not accuſe him of wrong in the ſenſe of ſome others. Of what value then that notion about this *Righteouſneſs of God* which after many years thoughts I have offered, in the ſaid two former papers (p. 26. 27. &c. of the one

one: p. 7. & &c. of the other) I leave to Time (when it hath brought the ſame light into ſome other more authoritative pen, that is to forget from whence it came) to make the diſcovery, and improvement. I will adde but thus much more; by way of ſurpluſage to it. *Juſtitiam in Deo ſacra Scriptura ſæpe nominat condecentiam bonitatis ipſius, ut Scholaſtici loquuntur: & Deum juſtum vocat, quum facit ea quæ congruunt ejus ſapientiæ, æquitati & benignitati.*

There is no man ſinneth not, ſayes *Solomon*, in his Prayer at the Dedication of the Temple. This he enlarges in his Eccleſiaſtes: *There is not a juſt man upon Earth, that doeth good and ſinneth not.* The Apoſtle to the Romans confirms this out of the Pſalmes; *There is none that doeth good, no not one.* St. *James* likewiſe gives his Suffrage. *In many things we offend all.* And St. *John* is yet moſt poſitive. *If we ſay we have no ſin we deceive our ſelves, and the truth is not in us.* On the other ſide, *He that committeth ſin* (ſayes the ſame Apoſtle) *is of the Devil.* He that is *born of God keepeth himſelf that the wicked one toucheth him not.* Whoſoever is *born of God* [illegible]*eth not commit ſin: For his Seed remaineth in him, and he cannot ſin, becauſe he is born of God.* St. Auguſtine I remember in ſeveral places of his Books does lay ſome two or three of theſe Texts together, and offers us this ſolution. *That which is born of God* (ſayes he) *ſins not.* Which is as much as to ſay, There is *that* which is *born* of God in the true Chriſtian, and that which is *not* born of him. In other terms, no man is regenerate but in part, or ſanctified but in part. Not as if one faculty was ſanctified, and not another: But there remaines the principle of Corruption, together with the principle of Grace which is infuſed, that is both fleſh and Spirit, in the ſame perſon: And whatſoever proceeds from the one cannot be in, as whatſoever proceeds from the other cannot be otherwiſe. I will adde, According to the prevalency there is of any of theſe two principles in the ſoul, ſo is the perſon to have his denomination. The Apoſtle therefore ſpeaking of himſelf when he *did* the evil he *would not*, it is *no more* I (ſays he) *that* does it, *but ſin that dwelleth in me.* If it be not *he* then that does it, the perſon being denominated from the will; and more generally pre-

ling part) is said to *sin not*. And this I take it, after *Austine*, is ordinarily received by Divines. Nevertheless, that which I propose here from what is said, seems to me to be more clear and weighty. There are some Texts say that all men are sinners, and others that the regenerated do *not sin*, and the blood of Christ *cleanseth us from all sin*. I distinguish then of sin. Sin is the Transgression of a Law, and as there is a twofold Law, so is there a twofold Transgression. There is the transgression of the *Law of Works*: Or the transgression of the *Law of Faith*. Every man upon Earth does sin against the Law of Works, in leaving undone what it requires, or doing what it forbids in Thought, Word or Deed, even *continually*; but there is no man sins against the Law of Grace, so, as to leave undone what that requires as the condition of life, who is saved. It is true, that as *all Power is committed to the Son*, the Law of Nature is put into Christs hands to be commanded by him, which together with remedying Grace, are parts of his Law. Distinguish therefore between sinning against one or other Precept of Christs Law: and sinning against [illegible] as a conditional Covenant, by *nonperformance*.

It will be for profit, yet, to multiply the same matter. *If thou wilt enter into Life* (says Christ) *keep the Commandements*. Neither *Circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth any thing* (says the Apostle) but *Faith working by love* in one place, but *a new Creature* in another, but *the keeping the Commandements of God* in a third. *Do we make void the Law through Faith? No, we establish it*. That the *Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit*. *The Doers of the Law shall be justified*. It appears by multitudes of such Scriptures as these, that the Law, or commandements of God are to be kept or fulfilled; that the fulfilling them is required as necessary to the person justified, and consequently as the condition (which is all one) of pardon and life. To help us out here therefore, we must distinguish after our more sober and best Divines; The Law of God may be considered *rigidly*, κατ' ακριβειαν: or *not rigidly*, κατ' επιεικειαν, that is, with condescention to human frailty, according to the *measure* in every one *of the gift of Christ*, or according to *our Model*, strength or grace in this Life, & that degree of performance

formance God which requires of us, preciſely in the new Covenant, to the obtaining Salvation. It is in the *latter* the *mild* the *gracious*, not in the *former* the *rigid* ſenſe, that ſuch Texts are to be interpreted; that the Law or Commandements are fulfilled; and that the obſervation is made *neceſſary* to the juſtified and ſaved. That is, I ſay again, not according to the *model* of our ſtate of *innocency*, but *faln* eſtate; not according to the *Rigour* of the Law, but *Equity* of the Goſpel; not according to the tale of Brick or preſcript of *Do this and live*, but according to Gods merciful acceptation of what we do through the meritorious obedience and oblation of Chriſt Jeſus. I muſt bring this yet more home. As the Law is taken for the Law moral or Law of Nature, the matter of the Commandement, is the ſame (I have ſaid) in the Law of Chriſt, Grace and Goſpel, as in the law of Works: onely this *materia præcepti*, this matter required, may be conſidered as *materia abſoluta*, or *conditionata*, as our *duty*, or as the *condition* of Salvation. There is no man keeps the Commandements of Chriſt ſo as never to faile in any thing of his *duty*: But every Child of God keeps them ſo as they are made the *condition* of Life in the new Covenant. When a man then performes the Covenant, he muſt be judged Righteous according to that Covenant. As there is nothing lacking in that performance to the Terms, he is Perfect; and as he is Righteous and Perfect, he *ſins not*; that is, he failes not of what is required to the performance of the condition. When St. *John* therefore ſpeaks of *ſinning not*, we may obſerve how he counterpoiſes *committing ſin* with being *Righteous* or *doing Righteouſneſs* in the ſame Chapter. The true Chriſtian *ſins not* ſo as oppoſes his *being Righteous*, he *commits not ſin*, as is contradictory to *doing Righteouſneſs*. He is Righteous now we know, or doeth Righteouſneſs, onely in regard to the Covenant of Grace, and he *ſins not* accordingly, in regard to this Covenant; that is (as I ſum all up), failes not in the performance of the condition. He performs not *materiam abſolutam*, the whole *duty*, but he performes *materiam conditionatam*, the whole *condition* of the Goſpel.

By the way here, when the calm Proteſtant will grant to the Papiſts ſuch a fulfilling of the Law as does conſtitute a real true righteouſneſs

righteousnes, and that which is perfect or entire according to the covenant of grace, and so accepted of God unto Life: and the most violent Papists will grant to the Protestant that this righteousnes nevertheless (*suo modo perfecta, non omni prorsus caret peccato, ideoq; ex hac parte perfectu non est*) is not without all Sin, but doeth both faile in the degree which the Law exacts, and is intermingled with many at least venial transgressions, so that it cannot abide Gods district judgment according to the Law of works, without need of Christs merits & Gods mercy, who does not see an agreement in the *purpose* and *mind*, where there is yet so much variance in the *words* and *pens* of those that contend about those matters? That Justification is a dispute of the like nature and issue, I doubt not; and it is an excellent pretty book of Mr. *Bradshawes* on that subject, yet does he seem to me, not to have touched this main thing, which I have noted once and again in my former papers to be that, the want of the notice whereof hath set the *Papist* and us together by the ears, and the understanding whereof will as presently heal our Controversies: to wit, That it is not by the *Law of works*, but by the *Law of Grace* that we are judged, when we stand before Gods Bar for Justification. There are but two things to be pleaded (sayes that worthy Authour) by an accused person. Either that he hath not committed the fault: or that he hath satisfyed for it. *No mortal* (says he) *can devise any other medium whereby such a person should be justifyed.* Our practical Divines do accordingly thunder against self Righteousnes upon this foundation. If we stand on our own Righteousnes (say they) then must we be able to satisfy God for our former sins, and cleanse our hearts for the time to come so as to be perfect in his sight. But this is a mistake. That there is a righteousnes of ours that we must not wholly cast away in our Justification, appeares from the Psalmist, when he tells us by the rule of contrarys, that it is the *righteous* and the righteous onely, that shall *stand in Judgment*. There is a third plea therefore, which is the onely true plea which must be brought, and made good or we perish; and that is, not that we are faultless or perfect according to the law of works (either in our selves or another): but that we are justifyable by the covenant of mercy

as

as performers of the condition, and that this righteouſs though imperfect is acceptable through the merits of our Redeemer. For the buſines then of Satisfaction, it muſt be treated a little otherwiſe then Mr. *Bradſhaw* does it, and others, that is, not to be made the matter, or formal reaſon, of that righteouſneſs that juſtifyes us (let me ſay, the *whole* matter or formal reaſon, for I may be out elſe on the otherſide ſeeing *Chriſts merits*, our *faith* or evangelical obedience, and *pardon* have all their proper parts and office in it): but it muſt be underſtood mainly to ſerve the honour and juſtice of God, as Rector and Law giver, in regard to his dealing with us otherwiſe then according to the Law of our creation as elſe he was bound: for upon this ſcore were the ſufferings of Chriſt *penall*, and undergone in *our ſtead*, to wit, that *by meanes of death for the redemption of us from the tranſgreſſions of the firſt Covenant*, a new Law or Covenant might be brought in, according to which we are to be judged. And when it is at that bar we muſt ſtand, we eaſily know both what that righteouſueſs is which muſt be pleaded, and for whoſe worthyneſs ſake (ſo inconſiderable otherwiſe as it is) it ſhall be accepted unto remiſſion and life everlaſting.

To return, the Apoſtle ſpeaking of the Law does tell us, that he that breakes but *one of the commandements* is guilty of all; and the reaſon he renders is, becauſe he requires that *one*, that required the *reſt*. The meaning is, God gave his whole Law to man for a Covenant, and if one part onely be tranſgreſſed, the condition of that covenant is broken as well as if all were tranſgreſſed. For otherwiſe, he that hath layen with a woman is not therefore to be accuſed for murder; nor he that hath ſworn an oath, is therefore guilty of theft. We muſt underſtand the like in reference to the Law of faith, or covenant of grace, and its obſervation. Let a mans ſins be what they will, ſo long as the condition be performed, he may according to this Law be judged no tranſgreſſour. In the one, a man hath committed no theft no adultery nor idolatry, and yet in the ſenſe of the Apoſtle he is *guilty of all*, In the other he hath bin an idolater, an adulterer, a thief (*ſuch were ſome of you but you are juſtified*), and he is guilty of none. The reaſon in both I ſay is, the condition ſtill in the *one* is broken, but performed in the *other*. As we

 diſtinguiſh

distinguish of the Law, *Quâ fœdus, & Quâ regula*: so may we of the performance, *Sub genere officii, & Sub genere conditionis*. Though we fail in our *Duty*, we fulfill the *Condition*, as I have said already.

To this purpose, it is not to be forgotten what is said of *David*, that *his heart was perfect, that he kept Gods Commandements, and that he sinned not but in the matter of* Uriah. And how I pray was that? Do not we read of *Davids* Passion, his Lying, his Numbring the people, his dealing with *Mephibosheth*? was there no sin indeed that *David* did commit besides this? what makes him then complain so much, that he was *born in Iniquity*, and that his *sins were more than the hairs upon his head?* I answer, there are sins consistent with sincerity, and inconsistent with it. Sins inconsistent with sincerity are breaches both of the Law of Works, and Covenant of Grace, and that *sub ratione conditionis*: Sins consistent with it, are transgressions indeed of the Law, but *sub hac ratione*, no breach of this Covenant. *Davids* sins of the first sort were very many, and his acknowledgments pious and true: *Davids* sins of the latter sort was but only in that matter, and otherwise it is said that he *sinned not*. To be clear as I goe, even for *that matter*, As *I* have distinguished between the breach of our *duty*, and the *condition*; or of the *preceptive* part of the law of grace, and the *conditional*: So must *I* distinguish *this breach of the condition*, into that which may be *pro tempore*, making the punishment so far due, as that God may cut off the Sinner and damne him: or else *final* also, making it peremptorily and remediless due, which will be ever executed by him. *There is a sin unto death, and a sin not unto death*, says the Apostle. A sin *against the Holy Ghost*. Whatsoever instance there may be, in which such a sin hath been committed, as in the obstinacy of the *Jews* against Christ, that rather than they would believe, they would impute his Miracles to the Devil, the general nature of this sin does lye in this, that it is such, as is inconsistent with, and exclusive of the performance of the terms which are required unto pardon and life. The *Spirit* and *New Testament* are one, and this is to sin (*N. B.*) against the *New Testament*. *De peccato ad mortem quoniam non expressum est, possunt diversa sentiri; Ego autem dico id esse peccatum,*

tum, fidem quâ per dilectionem operatur deſerere uſq; ad mortem. Concerning the ſin unto death, becauſe it is not expreſſed, divers things may be thought of it; but I ſay that ſin is this, to deſert (or never come up to) *that faith which worketh by love, unto death.* Auguſtine. *De Cor. & gra.* c. 12. It muſt be demanded then, what ſhall we think of *David in the matter*, wherein he is accounted to have *ſinned*? *I* ſay that *David* (according to our Britiſh Divines in the Synod of *Dort*) in that preſent ſtate, could not have been ſaved, if he had died: but God having Elected *David*, provided Repentance for him, that he could not dye in that eſtate. There is a ſin therefore which is inconſiſtent with ſincerity of heart, or the terms of grace, at *preſent*; or ſuch a ſin, or ſins, which are *excluſive* of it. This *I* ſaid in other words but now. The latter only are ſins unto death. The breach of the Covenant of grace *ſub ratione conditionis* is that ſin, and when final, that alone which is unpardonable. *I* reaſſume, that whatſoever ſins conſequently, they be which any man commits, if they be not ſuch as are incompatible with Sincerity, Repentance, and Faith, they are ſins againſt the Law, and our pardon is purchaſed: but they are no breach (*ſub hac ratione*, *I* muſt intend ſtill) of the Law of Grace, no ſin unto death, or no ſin as can hinder the perſon from being judged as *righteous* by that Law or Covenant, and to be accepted accordingly unto everlaſting Salvation.

And now Sirs! Behold here a kind of Heaven opened to you, *I* mean to you who are the Children of God, and fear his Name, where all your ſins and iniquities are removed, and where every one of you are *righteous* and *perfect* and *ſin not*. For this is the benefit and fruit of Chriſts Death and Redemption, that he hath delivered you from that Law which you break, and would condemn you for every breach; and he hath brought you under a new Law, the Law of Grace, which requires nothing of you, but what *ſub rat one Conditionis* you do keep, for he gives his holy Spirit herein, to enable you to the performance. So that, it is not only your ſins are *done away*, that is *not imputed*, or *forgiven* (*The Iniquities of* Judah, it is ſaid, *ſhall be ſought for, and not found*), but this Covenant hath nothing to lay to your charge. *And you that were ſometimes alienated, hath he now reconciled in*

the body of his flesh, through death, to present you holy and unblameable, and unreprovable in his sight, if ye continue in the Faith, grounded and setled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel. And thus we are come to our period. We grant a perfection which Divines call *Evangelical* to the Quaker, that is an integrity of heart and life which the Gospel requires of every man that shall be saved. If these Friends will have more (who have not understood perhaps before, how much indeed this is, and what truly they impugne), then they must come to that our Divines call *Legal* righteousnes or perfection, which is to live so, as never to break any of Gods precepts, both *ratione officii, & conditionis*; and if they will maintain this, either that they have it (or have attain'd it) in themselves, or that it is necessary to others unto salvation, *I* shall tenderly offer them these ensuing Arguments, Reasons, or Consideratious for reclaiming them from so desperate an opinion.

In the first place, Be it known, that in the *Diospolitan* Councel, *An. Do.* 415. this was one of *Pelagius* errours which was there Condemned. *Filios Dei non posse vocari, nisi qui omni modo absque omni peccato fuerint effecti.* *That they cannot be called Gods Sons, who are not in all regards, without any manner of sin.* Which errour also *Pelagius* himself there retracted.

In the second place it is worthy onr knowing, what was the ground or reason of his conviction. becaufe it is like that the same consideration or argument may prevail upon one or other (and more then so) of this Sect, that have but the like rational judgments. *Nono fatetur filios dei posse vocari illos qui quotidie dicunt dimitte nobis debita nostra, quod & utique veraciter non dicerent, si essent omnino absque peccato.* *To the nineth Article, he confesses that they may be the Sons of God, who say daily, forgive us our Trespasses, which verily they could not say, if they were altogether without sin.* The Fathers of that Council urged this upon him, that if none could be born of God that were not altogether perfect, then must none of Christs Disciples be his Children; for how could they pray to him to forgive their debts, if they had no sin to be forgiven? How could they pray daily for pardon, if they were any day without transgression? *Nathaniel* was one of the Disciples of whom it is said, he was *without guile*, and con-

conſequently as perfect as any Quaker dare preſume of himſelf; and yet *Nathaniel* as well as *Peter*, and *Peter* as well as any other true Believer, are taught by theſe words of their Lord, that they have need of daily forgiveneſs. It is ſufficient to this Argument, if *that* Prayer be held but a *pattern*, and no *form*, as ſome will have it; ſo long as they do not *I* hope, yet think they may ſcratch it out of their Bibles, becauſe they leave it unſaid.

In the third place, this opinion is againſt the uniform, conſtant ſtream of Gods word, and the writings of holy men, which ſtill run thus, that we are ſinners, that we muſt all repent, and that we muſt always be renewing our repentance, in making our Prayers, Confeſſions, Supplications, Doing our Almes and other good works, and reſting on Chriſt for grace and pardon. Without this ſuppoſition, the whole courſe of our Religion as Chriſtian, will ſink for want of a foundation. *Theſe things write I to you, that you ſin not; and if any man ſin, we have an Advocate with the Father, who is a propitiation for our ſins, and alſo for the ſins of the world.* There is *our* ſins, St. *John's* ſins, that need an Advocate as well as the world. When *Ezekiel* is picking out three of the moſt holy men that ever were (which inſtance *Auguſtine* alſo uſes) he names *Daniel*, *Noah*, and *Job*. Of *Noah* we have the record of *Moſes*, that he was overtaken. Of *Job*, we have his own acknowledgment. *If I juſtifie my ſelf, my own mouth ſhall condemn me; if I ſay I am perfect, it ſhall prove me perverſe.* Of *Daniel*, we have a whole Chapter where he is praying and confeſſing *his ſin* (as himſelf ſpeaks) *and the ſins of his people. What is man* (ſays *Eliphaz*) *that he ſhould be Clean, and he that is born of a Woman, that he ſhould be Righteous? Behold he putteth no truſt in his Saints, and the Heavens are not clean in his ſight; and how much more abominable and filthy is man, who drinketh Iniquity as water? We are all unclean* (ſays the Church, ſutably to this in *Iſay*) *and all our Righteouſneſſes are as filthy raggs.* There is one Text moſt full, as moſt common, not to be omitted, which is that of *David. Enter not into judgment with thy Servant, for in thy ſight ſhall no man living be juſtified.* This is applied by the Apoſtle againſt juſtification by the deeds of the Law. If there is, or ever was, any meer mortal on Earth that lived altogether without ſin, then muſt this Text be falſe;

then

then may ſome men living be juſtified in his ſight, though he enter into diſtrict judgment with them; then may ſome fleſh living be juſtified by works; then muſt ſalvation alone by Chriſt, and the Doctrine indeed of the whole Goſpel come to the ground. For,

In the fourth place, as this is againſt ſeveral particular Texts before named, and the general current of the Scripture and holy Writers: So is it directly againſt the very drift of what the Apoſtle delivers to the *Romans* and *Galathians*. It is common for men to alleadg a few ſcattered Scriptures againſt any opinion which yet is true, and we Anſwer thoſe Scriptures: but if an opinion does croſs any one Text, and much more any Epiſtle in the very ſcope and purport of it, ſuch an opinion muſt be left, or all will come to naught. It is manifeſt now that *Paul* in thoſe two Epiſtles is ſetting forth the Doctrine of *juſtification by Faith, through our Redemption by Chriſt Jeſus*. For the making this good, he firſt ſhews that all men whatſoever ſtands guilty before God of the breach of his Law. This he moſt induſtriouſly proves of the *Gentiles* in one Chapter; of the *Jews* in another; and in the third, *What then* (ſays he) *are we better than they? no, in no wiſe, for we have before proved both Jew and Gentile, that they are all under ſin*. Upon this *Medium*, he argues, that no man therefore, either *Jew* or *Gentile* can be juſtified by the Law, for then they ſhould be *doers*, and not *breakers* of it. From this truth, that they cannot be juſtified by the Law, it follows that there muſt be ſome other means of their juſtification. And this he declares (as the great concern and Goſpel he has to deliver), to be by *Faith, through the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus*. This is the ſum of his doctrine and arguing. We may if you will for our advantage put more together. If we are juſtified through Chriſts Redemption by Faith, when none of us have performed the condition which was required of us to our juſtification by the Law of our Creation, then muſt our juſtification be of grace or favour, as being not elſe due. And if this grace is obtained or purchaſed for us through Chriſts Redemption, then is God righteous, though he accepts of us (ſeeing it is for Chriſts ſake) without that condition. And if he is righteous in his accepting any without that condition, there muſt be ſome o-

ther

ther procured by Christ, upon which he accepts them, seeing all are not accepted, notwithstanding Christs Redemption. That other is Faith, as the *initium* and foundation of all other duty, that is *Faith working by Love*, even that *Love* which *fulfils the Law*, and is *shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost given to us*, as *Augustine* that great assertour of grace still speaks. From hence does there appear that *Righteousness of God* which is set out in opposition to our Righteousness by the Law, and mentioned before in its due place; which indeed is nothing else but this grace it self, even the goodness, kindness, favour, or merciful condescention of God to poor Sinners, in accepting us as Righteous upon other terms, then those which the Law of our Nature requires, and it were but most just we should have performed. Which as he grants for Christs sake, so does he by his Spirit work in those that are his chosen, that all the glory of their Salvation may be due to him only. Now the perfection of the Quaker does quite over-throw all this which the Apostle teaches; and in short terms, it were all one for them to say, Sir, we deny your Argument, and your Reasoning. We are of opinion that all men do not break the Law of God, but that some are perfect in a Righteousness, answering the Law, and therefore we have no need of any such grace, or Christs Redemption (that is of any from Christ as *without*), or other terms, whereby we should be justified and saved. The Righteousness of *God*, or the Righteousness of *Faith* you speak of in opposition to *Works*, is below that of *ours*, which we build upon for our Salvation.

In the fifth place, This opinion is not consonant with the *Universality* of Redemption. There are no greater patrons of universal grace than the Quaker. This is the *excellency of his strength*, the *Ruben* of his notions. But if Christs Redemption lye altogether where they place it, in the bringing men off from Sin and Unrighteousness unto Holiness and Perfection, even such as to live without sin in this world, then cannot Redemption be universal: for the most of men remain in their sins, and are never converted; and those that are, reach not to such a pitch as this is; and consequently, instead of Christs having Redeemed all the World, or whole Man-kind, there are but very few Redeemed, and indeed none at all. I must confess I do not think

that

that the Quaker alone is in the dark about this matter. Yet theſe men I count here, are moſt of all out. They look upon the work of Chriſts Redemption to be the work of Chriſt *within*; ſo they ſpeak, and ſo they think altogether, and then wilfully confound *Sanctification* and *Redemption*; whereas Sanctification is a ſeparation of perſons from the world, and muſt be of *ſome* only, that is the *Elect* (ſuppoſing Election): but Redemption is of *all man-kind*, according to the Catechiſme, and the Scripture all over. That which Chriſt hath done for us *without*, and in the *fleſh*, is for all. He was put to death in the fleſh; his Death was for all. *He taſted Death for every man.* But what he does for us *within*, what he does in the *Spirit*, that is peculiar, and not alike to all; and the one muſt not be confounded with the other. It is worth our asking therefore, what Redemption and its immediate fruit to man-kind is? and this hath been diſpatcht in my paper about *Redemption*. The introduction of a new Covenant, and other terms for man to live by, is the main. The Quaker now does place Chriſts Redemption in bringing us up to theſe terms, the performance whereof is indeed our Goſpel-perfection; but he is here ſo miſerably out, that he both miſtakes the terms, or this perfection, as if it were no leſs then the fulfilling every jot of the Law it ſelf; & alſo contradicts himſelf in the beſt tenent he has. For how ſhall the grace of Chriſts Redemption be univerſal, if it be placed in that which is not univerſal? How ſhall Chriſts death be for *all*, if the great and immediate effect of it, be that which only belongs to the *Elect*? On the other hand, our Divines we call Orthodox, do generally ſtumble upon this ſame ſtone, in their denyal of Chriſts Redemption to be univerſal. It is not ſufficient to them for the holding Chriſts Redemption to be univerſal, that he hath procured that all may be ſaved, if they believe and repent, which are our new terms; unleſs he hath procured alſo that they believe and repent. But it is the Elect only do believe and repent, and therefore they hold the Redemption only of the Elect. Theſe men (how many of them ſoever they be) have not yet learned to diſtinguiſh the *condition* from the *performance*; and that Chriſts Redemption does lye in procuring the *condition*, not *performance*, for the *world*. They know and will ſay that there is

ano-

another condition required of us by the Law of our Creation, and if man may be juſtified without that, then muſt there be grace in the grant of this. And this grace they are then to underſtand more, is that grace which is ſo magnified in the Goſpel, the *grace* that came by *Jeſus Chriſt* as the *Law* by *Moſes*, the grace it ſelf of our Redemption. Let the Quaker then know it is not Chriſts bringing man up to the terms of God, but his bringing down God to the terms of man (that is, to ſuch as are ſutable to his ſalne eſtate), wherein the great work he hath done for us, is to be fixed. And let theſe Orthodox know the ſame likewiſe, that it muſt be therefore his procuring ſalvation upon our Faith and Repentance; and not Repentauce and Faith for our Salvation, which is the direct and immediate effect of his Redemption. But what? *Is* not our Believing and Repentancè then the fruit and purchaſe of Chriſts death? Be not offended Sirs, our Faith and Repentance are a fruit of his Spirit, the work of our Sanctification, and proceeds from Election. See my reaſons in *p.* 29. of my firſt paper.

In the ſixth place. *It* ſeems to me, that the want of more light to diſcern between truth and truth, is the occaſion of perſiſting to theſe Friends in their errour, and to us in our oppoſition. *It* is true what we ſay, that no men but *ſin*; and it is true what they ſay, the Regenerate *ſin not*: The Scripture ſays both. The Child of God *ſins not*, ſo as that ſin hath *dominion* over him when he ſins. The prevailing intereſt of his Soul is for God above the fleſh and the world, and ſo long he is right in Gods ſight; right, *Righteous*, or *Perfect*, according to the Law of *Grace*; although there be a thouſand things wherein he might do more good, or leſs evil than he does, and ſo is imperfect, unrighteous, and a manifold ſinner according to the Law of *works*. The truth is, there is ſomething here at the bottom, which theſe men ſee, and our common Proteſtants do not ſee, which makes them think they ſee more than we, and more than they do ſee. *It* is this, that there can be indeed no juſtification of any, but according to ſome Law, where we can plead that we are innocent, or that we have kept that Law, and that perfectly, ſo that we are *Righteous* according to it. This being ſeen, they come on too faſt, that they ſin not; before they have learned to

diſtinguiſh between Law and Law, Righteouſneſs and Righteouſneſs, Juſtification and Juſtification, Sin and Sin. They ſin not, they are Righteous, and by that Righteouſneſs *I* muſt ſay with them (where they have our Divines on the blind ſide) are juſtified, to wit, according to the *Law of Faith*, or as they are judged at the Throne of Grace; but they do ſin, they are Unrighteous, and no fleſh living can be juſtified according to the *Law of Works*, or at the bar of the Ten Commandements. When the Apoſtle argues againſt juſtification by the Law, he proves none can be juſtified by it, becauſe all do break it. Thoſe that will follow truth ſhall argue as ſtrongly; if we be juſtified by grace, then we muſt be righteous and perfect, according to the *law* of it. The Orthodox are quite out that will have any juſtified without a Righteouſneſs that is perfect according to the Law that juſtifies him (to wit, in regard to the *conditional*, though not the *preceptive* part of it). The Quaker is quite out that will have this Righteouſneſs perfect according to the ten Commandements which does not juſtifie him. The lover of Truth and Mediocrity will have every man have the Righteouſneſs of a perfect heart for his juſtification, and yet no man be juſtified but by the grace of God, through the Redemption which we have in Chriſt Jeſus. There is pardon of ſin, and juſtification; theſe may be diſtinguiſhed, not divided. Pardon refers to the law of works; juſtification to the law of Faith, or the Goſpel. *For this cauſe* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *he is the Mediatour of the New Teſtament, that by means of death for the Redemption of the Tranſgreſſions that were under the firſt Teſtament, they which are called may receive the promiſe of eternal Inheritance.* The firſt Covenant originally is that of *Nature*, and the *firſt Teſtament* belonging to the Jew, *repreſented* that firſt Covenant, and the Tranſgreſſions for which Chriſt ſhed his blood, are our ſins only againſt that Covenant: *If* there be any body ſins againſt the new Covenant, there is no Redemption for ſuch. We have a *pardon* then in reference to the law of works, but we are *juſtified* in reference to the law of Faith. To wit, *If* we are accuſed as Tranſgreſſors of the *Law*, we may confeſs it that we are guilty, and plead our pardon through Chriſts Redemption; but if we are charged as Tranſgreſſors of the *law of grace*, we muſt

muſt not plead our ſelves guilty but righteous, and ſuch as perfectly come up to the terms required in the Goſpel, or elſe we are gone. It is true, Chriſt hath purchaſed forgiveneſs, but it is upon condition. *Pardon* is of the Tranſgreſſions of the Law, but this *condition* is of Righteouſneſs according to the Goſpel, and our juſtification lyes in the performance of the condition.

In the ſeaventh place, This Opinion, inſtead of leading theſe friends to the *Spirit* and the *Life* as they ſpeak, does lead them *from* both, and bring them back to the *letter*, and the *fleſh*, and *miniſtration of death*. To underſtand this, The Apoſtle we know does diſtinguiſh between the *Letter* and the *Spirit*. The *Letter killeth, the Spirit giveth Life*. This diſtinction is expreſſed otherwhere by the *Law of the Spirit of life*, and the *Law of ſin and death*. The Law of *Faith*, and Law of *Works*. The Covenant of *Nature*, and Covenant of *Grace*. The Law of Works is call'd the *Letter*, as having been writ in ſtone, and is the miniſtration of death, *the Law of ſin and death*, or that which *killeth*, becauſe there is none but break it, and ſo are guilty of ſin and death by it. The Covenant of grace is the *Law of Faith*, that being the condition of it; it is the *Law of the ſpirit of life*, or the miniſtration of life for the contrary reaſon, becauſe we are enabled through grace or this ſpirit, to the performance of this Law, ſo as to be Righteous according to it, and live by it. *The juſt man ſhall live by his Faith*. And unto the Law of the ſpirit of life, is added, *in Chriſt Jeſus*, becauſe it is he hath procured this Law for us, which is indeed the great benefit of our Redemption. Now while the Spirit is given us for the performance of the condition of this Covenant, (it being the *New Teſtament*, not the *Law* which is the miniſtration of the Spirit) it is a great miſtake in theſe Friends to expect ſuch help from it, as to perform the condition of the Covenant of Nature, or Law of Works. The Spirit indeed does help us, but it is to keep his own Law, the *Law of the Spirit*, and that Law whereby we may have *life* If we do look to fulfill the Covenant of Nature, we muſt return to our original Righteouſneſs, and our free will which we loſt in *Adam*, and that is to go from the *Spirit* to our ſelves who are but *fleſh*. But what? Is not the Law of God the rule of our lives? and does not the Spirit of God lead us ac-

according to rule, and bring us to a conformity to his law? I answer, no doubt of it: but that is a conformity so far as reaches the fulfilling the terms of the *Gospel*, but not those of *Works*. The law of grace does require a sincere walking before God in all his Commandements, and the Spirit of God does certainly help us so far as we sin not against that sincerity, or sin, no sins inconsistent with these terms: but the spirit is not given to bring us up to the terms of the Law, and that we should not sin at all. *What shall we say that* Abraham *as pertaining to the flesh hath found*? By the *flesh* we are to understand *works* as appears in the next verse: and so is the *spirit* opposed to the *flesh*, as it is opposed to the *law of works*. If we seek therefore for a Righteousness by our works, that is according to that law, we shall find what *Abraham* did, as *pertaining to the flesh*. We shall find no such matter. *O ye foolish Galathians* (says the Apostle) *having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?* The *Galathians* belike who had received the doctrine of grace by *Paul*, were come to be seduced to the opinion that they must keep *Moses* Law, or else they could not be saved; and this is their seeking to be made *perfect by the flesh*. The *flesh* and *nature* are Synonymous terms, and as in respect of those who were *Jews by Nature*, the works of the Law, as given by *Moses* are called flesh: so must the works of the Law, as a Covenant by Nature, be flesh in respect to the rest of man-kind. If the Quaker then is come to seek life by such a following his light as must answer the Covenant of Nature it self; that is by a perfection as is without sin against the Law, he is plainly under the notion of the *spirit*, brought at last to the *flesh* for what he seeks.

In the last place, It is an ancient saying that he who looks but one thing is easily mislead. It seems that these Friends do apprehend that our doctrine which opposes perfection does serve for the boulstring up men in their sins, and lull them into security, that though they live and dye in their wickedness, they must be saved; and this being taught especially among us Protestants, who believe that we are justified by Christs Righteousness without works, does appear very destructive to many souls, which makes them out of an intention which we may suppose zealous for godliness, and the promotion of a good life,

to

to fall on our Divines with ſo much tragical exclamation as they do on this point: When in the mean time they neither have conſidered what our Divines do ſay that removes all ground for any ſuch abuſe; nor what indeed are the conſequences of their own doctrine, which under *Pelagianiſme*, *Donatiſme*, and the like names, hath been ſo often exploded as utterly intolerable in the Church of God. For their conviction in both theſe, *I* would not in the way have them ignorant what doctrine it was *Paul* Preached, and upon which the like conſequences was faſtened by ſome perſons at that time, that if grace abounded, they might therefore live in ſin: *It* is but the ſame doctrine of Gods abounding free grace, mercy, and forgiveneſs through Chriſt to poor Sinners that our Divines do bring againſt the doctrine of perfection (ſetting the unſound ſenſe of imputed Righteouſneſs aſide), which *Paul* Preached, and pleaded againſt thoſe who would bring in the works of the Law for their juſtification. And when theſe Friends have pondered the Apoſtles anſwer to what was alleadged againſt him, there will need but little more to be ſaid by us here unto the ſame. There are two things particularly our Divines teach. The one is, that notwithſtanding grace be imperfect in this life, there is no man may ſin for all that, in any the leaſt thing whatſoever: That is, though our holineſs be imperfect, yet is it our *duty* to be perfect, and we are ſtill to be preſſed to *go on to perfection*. The other is that a ſtate of grace will not ſtand with any ſin in *dominion*. That is, that whoſoever does willingly and wilfully live in any known ſin without Repentance unto death, he cannot be ſaved. And what is the reaſon then, when theſe two things are ſtill taught, that theſe men ſhould charge the Orthodox with that conſequence which they do ſo effectually diſclaim? Let them look into any practical Books of ours, and ſee if obedience, which is univerſal, be not given as the chief note ſtill of an upright man, and of that Faith which is ſaving? And what would they themſelves now ſay more? *If* this rather, without ſome [illegible] (as ſo far as human frailty, according to the ſeveral complexions, circumſtances, and temptations of perſons, by infinite goodneſs and wiſdom will be allowed) be not more ſtrict than can be borne. Will it not indeed ſuffice that a man is upright

upright before God in his *desires* and *endeavours* after perfection, that is the *having respect to all his commandments*, unless he also be perfect, and his works overtake his will? What then shall become of the generation of the most just? Let us see when this one inconvenience they apprehend as consequent to our doctrine is wiped off, whether the several inconveniences that follow their doctrine doe not require more heed.

First then, where they say our doctrine does lead men into security, remisness of life, neglect of their duty, a sinfull course: how must their doctrine hurle men into despaire, and lead them by that to the casting off the whole care of God and their souls altogether? There is no meanes under Heaven so likely to bring a man to give up all, as to make him desperate. If it will not serve a man for his acceptance with God that he is sincere in his desires and endeavours of walking before him, unless he attain to perfection, or to a life that is wholy without sin in this world, then must the heart of the most holy and mortified man upon earth be quite broke and discouraged for ever. *There is mercy with thee* (sayes David) *that thou maist be feared*, If God were not good and merciful to consider mans frailty, to pardon his shortnesses and imperfections, and bear with him, we should not *fear* him, that is worship or serve him, for it were to no purpose to go about it, seeing we could never please him. Alas! that these folkes did but know what they do, when they bring in such doctrine, who themselves must tremble to be judged by it. O ye *fooliſh Galathians! who hath bewiched you*, that you should depart from that comfort and peace which some of you I believe sometimes had in believing and trusting on Christ altogether for your pardon and reconciliation with God, that you should be brought now to the works of the Law, and these terms, that if you *do them* you shall *live in them?* Is there any indeed of you think that you are able, and doe *continue in all things that are written in the book of the Law*, or in all things that are written in the *tables of your hearts* to do them? And are you ignorant that upon that account, and that alone, that none do, or are able to do so the Apostle tells you, *As many as are of the works of the Law are*

under

under the curſe? Alas Sirs! what mean you, when we are under the miniſtration of the New-Teſtament, which brings the *Spirit* and *liberty* (where the Spirit is there is liberty), and *righteouſnes* (for by the law of faith the Chriſtian hath a righteouſneſs to plead and to be juſtified by) and ſo *life*, you ſhould be ready to return into a *Jewiſh* or *Natural* bondage, to ſeek for it from that onely which can bring *death*, and is the miniſtration of ſin and condemnation?

Secondly, I wiſh, into whatſoever conſequence our doctrine may lead ſome of our people, that your doctrine does not lead your people into ſome evils more ſecret and ſpiritual, but much more deadly to the ſoul, then our ordinary ſins are. When we ſhall ſee a perſon (ſuppoſe ſome Youth of either Sex) as ſoon as they are but wrought over to your party, be ready immediately to look on all the reſt of people at a diſtance to a neglect, nay even to a contempt of the moſt grave, ſerious, holy of profeſſours which they before converſed withall, and ſo talk to them as if they knew nothing ſtreight in compariſon of them, but as men altogether in the dark without *light* or *life* were to be ſeparated from, till they arrive to *their* attainment, or higher ſtate. I know not what you your ſelves may *ſay* at ſuch a ſight, nor what ſome others may *think* who paſſe it by with a ſmile or jeſt at the folly, or elſe with wrath, ſcorn, and indignation at the inſolence, and infinite preſumption: but I for my part muſt profeſſe it, as to my own ſoul, to be a matter of a very deep, ſad, and afflictive apprehenſion, to behold ſuch a *novice* falling into the *condemnation of the Devil*. Alas! what is it if the Devil himſelf were again in his firſt ſtation that he would ſay, but I am now in that Seraphical ſtate, as is above all Cherubims, Thrones, Dominions, Angells, Archangells. I am like God, and none of theſe are like to me. If pride, if Spiritual pride, if the moſt damnable pride, to be proud of Gods grace, which conſiſts in ſuch a monſtrous overweening conceit of a mans ſelf as this, that he is *perfect* (and in one too who hath ſcarce broken the ſhell yet in Religion), to the neglect, deſpiſing, continual cenſuring, and ſetting at naught of others, be no evil, then may the prudent, the ſober, and pious amongſt you who are beſt able to ſee, and to mourn for the miſcarri-

ages

ages of your ſect, have leſſe reaſon to fear the tendency of this doctrine of *Perfection*: But if it be the way of Chriſtians to be humble, to look on themſelves as vile, as nothing, to live altogether on dependance upon God, each man in lowlines of mind eſteeming of others better then themſelves, then will it be your duty to have more care of what you are to rebuke, and of what you are to teach. *Leaſt that which is lame be turned out of the way, and that which is weak be deſtroyed.*

Laſt of all, There is the danger, that exceeding danger in the very entainment of this opinion, that I am afraid at my heart it cannot conſiſt (if prevalent) with the grace of God, and juſtification of a ſinner by Chriſt. It is a high text, that of the Apoſtle. *Behold I Paul ſay unto you that if you be circumciſed Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing.* Circumciſion was a bond to the keeping the whole law, and if the *Galathians* upon the opinion that the Law muſt be kept for their juſtification were circumciſed, they are like as it ſeemes here to bring themſelves into that condition as to ſtand or fall by it. Let them look to it then, if they break but one of the commandements, to the whole whereof they are debtors, the bond is forfeit. The like inſtance is that we have in the *Jews* themſelves. God had given them his Law, which was indeed to direct them in a holy life; but the chief end of it was through conviction of ſin to drive them to God for his pardon and grace, which was to be received through the promiſe, by their Faith. Now the *Jews* being ignorant of this end, look to the Law only for Righteouſneſs, and are loſt. I am really afraid at my very heart Sirs, leaſt your caſe be the very ſame in effect with theſe. You have the Goſpel Preached, and if you accept of your pardon through Chriſt there is no more required, but the walking ſincerely before him, and acknowledging him your *Advocate* if you ſin, and you may be ſafe; but you have taken up an opinion that the whole Law muſt be kept, that you muſt live without ſin, and unleſs you come up to this pitch, you cannot be ſaved. What is here then, I ſay, but ſuch an Opinion as that of the *Galathians*, and ſuch an eſtabliſhing of your own Righteouſneſs as the *Jews* was; only with this difference indeed in both, that it is *more*. For the Righteouſneſs of the Law, as given by

Moſes,

Moſes, was not thought by them ſo ſtrict as we know it to be, as given by *Nature*. And if they ſhall ſtand for their lives upon theſe terms, who is not apprehenſive of the danger of ſuch Doctrine? *For I teſtifie again to every man, that whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law, ye are fallen from Grace.* I remember when Feſtus had brought *Paul* out to *Agrippa*, and he had opened and pleaded his cauſe before him, *Agrippa* ſaid unto *Feſtus*, *This man might have been ſet at liberty, if he had not appealed to Cæſar.* If theſe Friends, being at the Bar of the Goſpel, would ſtand to that grace we have there, they might be freed by courſe with other honeſt Chriſtian folks, through the Redemption which is in Chriſt Jeſus. Who hath any thing to charge upon them? But if they will appeal from thoſe terms under which we are brought by Chriſt, unto their perfection, which is the terms of the Law, to be judged by that; what can we ſay elſe, but they have appealed unto *Cæſar*, and to *Cæſar* muſt they go. Unto your perfection you have appealed, and when you ſhall be found imperfect, as all fleſh living muſt be, what ſhall become of you before the great Tribunal of God? O Lord! Thou ſeeſt mans fooliſhneſs, and knoweſt his danger. *If* any of theſe poor people are indeed upon ſuch a precipice, as my Soul fears for them, deliver them, ſave them from it, bring them to a right mind, that they may not depart from thy grace, to go to their own Ciſterns. *They went to the Wells, and there was no Water; they returned with their Veſſels empty, and were aſhamed.* We have a ſingular preſident in *Job*. A man may wonder ſometimes why God ſhould deal ſo ſeverely with that Saint. It was not perhaps without cauſe. *Job* was a holy perſon, and he knew it, he ſtood upon it; and it is poſſible he might by that temper of his, be one who in the eſtabliſhing this *Righteouſneſs of his own*, was apt to forget to ſubmit to the *Righteouſneſs of God*, and that this was the very ſecret cauſe which makes him have need of ſo ſufficient a courſe to be taken for reducing him out of that danger. Friends! Let me ſpeak to you here in thoſe words which *Eliphaz* did to his Friend. Surely you have ſpoken in my hearing, and *I* have heard the voyce of your words, ſaying, *We are Clean without Tranſgreſſion; we are Innocent, neither is there Iniquity in us.* Let me then ſpeak to you in the words al-

ſo of God. *Who are theſe that darken Counſel with words without knowledge? I* humbly beſeech the Lord, that what is offered here unto you, to the like end (ſuppoſing the end of the Lord to *Job*, herein to be ſuch), may be received with the like effect. That you may ſay, *Behold we are vile, what ſhall we anſwer thee? we will lay our hands on our mouths. Once have we ſpoken, but we will not anſwer; yea twice, but we will proceed no further.*

Auguſtine. Cont. Ep. Parmen. l. 2. c. 6.

Quamvis in quantum ex deo nati ſumus non peccemus, ineſt tamen adhuc etiam quod ex Adamo nati ſumus. Et quamdiu expectamus per patientiam corporis noſtri redemptionem, non audeamus dicere carere nos omni vitio, ne ipſa ſuperbia ſit immaniſſimum vitium. *Although in ſo much as we are born of God, we ſin not, yet does there remain in us that too, which is born of* Adam; *and ſo long as we, through patience, do wait for the Redemption of the body, we dare not ſay that we are without all ſin, leaſt that very Pride it ſelf be a moſt monſtrous ſin.*

The End.

An Advertiſement.

Reader,

I Intended more Papers under this Title of the *Middle Way*; but being Diſcouraged, this (I ſuppoſe) is the laſt. You have one Paper of *Election* and *Redemption*, put that firſt: Another of *Juſtification*: A third of the *Covenants*, *Law*, and *Goſpel*: And this fourth of *Perfection*. Expect no more. The Bookſeller now will Bind them together. The letters (*N. B.*) are *Nota bene*. *Valete omnes*, *& condonate*.

Deo Gloria. I. H